# THE MUNICIPAL YEAR BOOK

1935

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/municipalyearboo0000clar_f1g4

DISCARD

# The Municipal Year Book

1935

SAN MATEO PUBLIC LIBRARY, SAN MATEO, CALIFORNIA

# The Municipal Year Book 1935

*The authoritative résumé*
*of activities and statistical data*
*of American cities*

EDITORS

CLARENCE E. RIDLEY
ORIN F. NOLTING

*CHICAGO*

THE INTERNATIONAL CITY MANAGERS' ASSOCIATION

1935

R
352
M92y

COPYRIGHT, 1935, BY
THE INTERNATIONAL CITY MANAGERS' ASSOCIATION

231139

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
AT THE LAKESIDE PRESS, R. R. DONNELLEY & SONS COMPANY
CRAWFORDSVILLE, INDIANA, AND CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

# FOREWORD

THIS second issue of a general Municipal Year Book is another stride toward a comprehensive volume of factual data on American city government. The demand for the 1934 volume has led to the inclusion this year of more than three times as many cities —all of the cities of over 10,000 population, compared to cities of over 30,000 last year. New sections included this year consist of one on local government units, an accurate count of which was made for the first time in 1934; data on the 96 metropolitan areas; classes of cities by states and forms of government; activities and services of state municipal leagues; and services rendered to municipal officials by federal agencies and national organizations of public officials. Data on the form of government, number and term of councilmen, utilities owned, and other data are reported for all cities of over 10,000 population.

A new section, Municipal Personnel, gives the number of employees in each city, salary and wage expenditures, salary cuts and restorations since 1930, and information on retirement plans. Eighty pages are devoted to the directory of 17 chief city officials in the cities of over 10,000, or a total of about 16,000 names. It is doubtful if there have ever been compiled in one place the names of so many of this country's public servants. If any justification is necessary for devoting so much space to this purpose it is found in our desire properly to recognize this vast army of people who are doing the day-to-day housekeeping jobs in the cities of this nation, many of whom are otherwise "unhonored and unsung." This directory of officials also gives the number of years each official has served in his present position and indicates how he is selected. A rapidly increasing number of officials, as members of their national professional organizations, are working to improve the administration of municipal functions. Considerable space is devoted to the services and activities of these organizations.

In addition to the directory of officials, other sections carried last year and included in this volume are the financial statistics of cities, directory of council-manager cities and city managers, selected publications, and current periodicals.

We direct special attention to the summary by Louis Brownlow and to articles by the editorial consultants of *Public Management* reviewing significant developments in 1934. Not only is considerably more space devoted to this section this year but these summaries are far more complete and comprehensive than in past years—made possible by the generous co-operation of 48 state correspondents, whose names are given on page 2. We are deeply indebted both to the authors of the summaries and to the state correspondents for only through their searching analysis of developments in the several states has it been possible to approach a comprehensive summary of local government developments in 1934.

The publication of this YEAR BOOK was made possible also through the unusually prompt and generous co-operation of nearly one thousand officials in as many cities, the secretariats of national organizations of public officials, the several state municipal leagues, officials of various federal agencies, and those who have prepared special articles in various sections. To all these individuals and organizations we owe a deep debt of gratitude.

Finally, our sincere thanks are due those who responded to our invitation last year to suggest improvements for subsequent issues. On them we bestow all credit for whatever improvement this volume may be over the initial issue which appeared last year. It is again our earnest desire that everyone who has occasion to refer to the data contained in this issue will oblige us not only by directing our attention to whatever errors they may discover, but also by suggesting further improvements in order that each succeeding issue may be better than the last.

THE EDITORS

Chicago
April, 1935

# CONTENTS

## Part One

## MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION

PAGE

Foreword . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . *The Editors* v

Municipal Administration in 1934:

Highlights and Forecast . . . . . . . . . . . *Louis Brownlow* 3
Administrative Organization . . . . . . . . *John B. Blandford, Jr.* 7
Personnel Administration . . . . . . . . . . *Clifford N. Amsden* 12
Financial Planning . . . . . . . . . . . . . . *C. E. Rightor* 15
Municipal Budgeting . . . . . . . . . . . . . . *A. E. Buck* 22
Taxation and Assessments . . . . . . . . . . *Philip H. Cornick* 24
Municipal Revenues . . . . . . . . . . . . . *Simeon E. Leland* 31
Municipal Accounting . . . . . . . . . . . . *Carl H. Chatters* 34
Public Purchasing . . . . . . . . . . . . . . *Russell Forbes* 37
Municipal Powers . . . . . . . . . . . . . . *C. W. Tooke* 39
Administrative Law . . . . . . . . . . . . . *Marshall E. Dimock* 45
City Planning and Zoning . . . . . . . . . . *Flavel Shurtleff* 51
Playgrounds and Recreation . . . . . . . . . *Jay B. Nash* 55
Public Welfare . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . *Frank Bane* 58
Housing . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . *Coleman Woodbury* 67
Public Health . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . *W. F. Walker* 72
Police Administration . . . . . . . . . . . . *O. W. Wilson* 75
Fire Administration . . . . . . . . . . . . . *Harold A. Stone* 80
Public Works . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . *Frank W. Herring* 86
Municipal Utilities . . . . . . . . . . . . . *John Bauer* 91
Schools and Education . . . . . . . . . . . *J. B. Edmonson* 100
Public Libraries . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . *Carl H. Milam* 104
Judicial Administration . . . . . . . . . . . *Herbert Harley* 107
County Government . . . . . . . . . . . . . *Paul W. Wager* 110
Council-Manager Government . . . . . . . . *Lyman S. Moore* 114

## Part Two

## GOVERNMENTAL UNITS

Local Government Units . . . . . . . . . . . *William Anderson* 121
Table I. Number and Distribution of Local Government Units by Types and States . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 123
Metropolitan Districts . . . . . . . . . . . . *Albert Lepawsky* 128
Table II. Metropolitan Districts of the United States . . . . . . . 133
Legal Classification of Cities by States *George C. S. Benson and Mary S. Benson* 136
Governmental Data on the 960 Cities Over 10,000 Population . . . . 164
Table III. Directory and Governmental Data for the 960 Cities of Over 10,000 Population . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 170

## PART THREE
## MUNICIPAL PERSONNEL

PAGE
STATE LEAGUES OF MUNICIPALITIES . . . . . . . . . . . . *C. C. Ludwig* 188
Table IV. State Municipal Leagues . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 190
MUNICIPAL PERSONNEL DATA . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 201
Table V. Personnel Data for 257 Cities Over 30,000 . . . . . . . . 204
MUNICIPAL RETIREMENT SYSTEMS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 210
Table VI. Data on Retirement Systems in 267 Cities Over 30,000 . . . 213
PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OF MUNICIPAL OFFICIALS . . *Robert M. Paige* 222
THE CITY MANAGER PROFESSION AND DIRECTORY . . . . . . . . . . . . 229
Table VII. Directory of Approved Council-Manager Cities, and City Managers . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 232
DIRECTORIES OF CITY OFFICIALS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 241
Table VIII-A. Directory of City Officials in All Cities Over 10,000 (Mayor, City Clerk, City Attorney, City Engineer, School Superintendent, Librarian) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 247
Table VIII-B. Directory of City Officials in All Cities Over 10,000 (Chief Finance Officer, City Assessor, City Treasurer, Purchasing Agent, Health Officer, Director of Public Welfare) . . . . 270
Table VIII-C. Directory of City Officials in All Cities Over 10,000 (Police Chief, Fire Chief, Director of Public Works, Water Works Superintendent, Parks and Recreation Director) . . . . . 293

## PART FOUR
## FINANCIAL STATISTICS OF CITIES

FINANCIAL STATISTICS OF CITIES . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 319
Table IX. Receipts, Assessed Valuations, and Delinquent Taxes in 1934 of 222 Cities Over 30,000 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 323
Table X. Expenditures in 1934 of 222 Cities Over 30,000 . . . . . 329
Table XI. Indebtedness in 1934 of 239 Cities Over 30,000 . . . . . 335

## PART FIVE
## SOURCES OF INFORMATION

SERVICES OF NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND FEDERAL AGENCIES . . . . . . 346
SELECTED BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, AND REPORTS . . . . . . . . . . . . . 371
SELECTED PERIODICALS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 387
INDEX . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 391

## PART ONE
# MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION

A Résumé of Municipal
Activities in 1934

# The State Correspondents

| | |
|---|---|
| *Alabama* | W. B. Holloway, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa. |
| *Arizona* | N. D. Houghton, University of Arizona, Tucson. |
| *Arkansas* | Kenneth O. Warner, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville. |
| *California* | John M. Pfiffner, University of Southern California, Los Angeles. |
| *Colorado* | Don C. Sowers, Colorado Municipal League, Boulder. |
| *Connecticut* | Rollin B. Posey, Research Department, City of Hartford. |
| *Delaware* | Russell Ramsey, Delaware Taxpayers' League, Wilmington. |
| *Florida* | C. T. Parsons, *Florida Municipal Record,* Jacksonville. |
| *Georgia* | Cullen P. Gosnell, Emory University, Atlanta. |
| *Idaho* | Joseph D. Wood, Idaho State Planning Board, Boise. |
| *Illinois* | A. D. McLarty, Illinois Municipal League, Springfield. |
| *Indiana* | Clyde F. Snider, University of Indiana, Bloomington. |
| *Iowa* | Carroll H. Wooddy, Department of Adult Education, Des Moines. |
| *Kansas* | John G. Stutz, League of Kansas Municipalities, Lawrence. |
| *Kentucky* | Roy H. Owsley, Kentucky Municipal League, Lexington. |
| *Louisiana* | Harold A. Stone, Bureau of Governmental Research, New Orleans. |
| *Maine* | Orren C. Hormell, Bowdoin College, Brunswick. |
| *Maryland* | Horace E. Flack, Department of Legislative Reference, Baltimore. |
| *Massachusetts* | Phillips Bradley, Amherst College, Amherst. |
| *Michigan* | Harold D. Smith, Michigan Municipal League, Ann Arbor. |
| *Minnesota* | Ambrose Fuller, League of Minnesota Municipalities, Minneapolis. |
| *Mississippi* | C. D. Ross, Mississippi Municipal Officers' Association, Jackson. |
| *Missouri* | Martin L. Faust, University of Missouri, Columbia. |
| *Montana* | Fred Bennion, Montana Taxpayers' Association, Helena. |
| *Nebraska* | Lane W. Lancaster, University of Nebraska, Lincoln. |
| *Nevada* | Edward G. Sutherland, University of Nevada, Reno. |
| *New Hampshire* | Milton V. Smith, Dartmouth College, Hanover. |
| *New Jersey* | Henry Reining, Jr., Princeton University, Princeton. |
| *New Mexico* | Rupert F. Asplund, Taxpayers' Association of New Mexico. |
| *New York* | Robert F. Steadman, Syracuse University, Syracuse. |
| *North Carolina* | Patrick Healy, Jr., North Carolina League of Municipalities. |
| *North Dakota* | M. H. Atkinson, League of North Dakota Municipalities. |
| *Ohio* | Harvey Walker, Ohio State University, Columbus. |
| *Oklahoma* | Frank C. Higginbotham, Oklahoma Municipal League, Norman. |
| *Oregon* | Herman Kehrli, League of Oregon Cities, Eugene. |
| *Pennsylvania* | H. F. Alderfer, Pennsylvania State College, State College. |
| *Rhode Island* | R. M. Goodrich, Providence Bureau of Governmental Research. |
| *South Carolina* | G. A. Buchanan, Jr., *The Columbia Record*, Columbia. |
| *South Dakota* | Herman H. Trachsel, University of South Dakota, Vermillion. |
| *Tennessee* | C. C. Sims, State Teachers' College, Murfreesboro. |
| *Texas* | Roscoe C. Martin, University of Texas, Austin. |
| *Utah* | Owen F. Beal, University of Utah, Salt Lake City. |
| *Vermont* | K. R. B. Flint, Norwich University, Northfield. |
| *Virginia* | Harold I. Baumes, League of Virginia Municipalities, Richmond. |
| *Washington* | Russell W. Barthell, League of Washington Cities, Seattle. |
| *West Virginia* | Hume K. Nowlan, League of West Virginia Municipalities. |
| *Wisconsin* | Frederick N. MacMillin, League of Wisconsin Municipalities. |
| *Wyoming* | Charles A. Bloomfield, University of Wyoming, Laramie. |

# Municipal Administration in 1934

A résumé of the more significant events and developments in the various fields of municipal administration in 1934 prepared for this Year Book by the editorial consultants of *Public Management,* based largely on information supplied by the state correspondents.

## HIGHLIGHTS AND FORECAST

By Louis Brownlow

*Director, Public Administration Clearing House, Chicago*

Cities and the people of the cities throughout 1934 continued to swirl about in the cyclone of political, economic, and social currents that we call The Depression. But at the end of the year and in the beginning of 1935 there are signs that the fury of the storm is abating; that municipal matters are on the mend; that the end is not yet upon us. For cities and the people of the cities, new decisions have been made, some from necessity and some from choice; and, more than at any one previous time, there is a nation-wide discussion of these decisions and of those that must or should be made in the immediate future. Because of the very fact that more people are thinking and talking of these municipal problems than ever before, there is an apparent increase in the confusion of the popular mind, and consequently a greater obligation than ever is laid upon those who have or can find the facts upon which just and wise decisions ought to be based.

Again, The Municipal Year Book appears in the hope and belief that it will be able in some measure to contribute toward the factual armament of those who will lead in the readjustment of municipal life to the changing needs of the times. As riders of the storm, the planners, the thinkers, the workers in the municipal field, have not agreed upon a course of action. Some of them have looked backward to the peace and prosperity of an olden, golden age that never was. Others have looked forward to the prosperity and peace of a perfected Utopia that never will be. Some of them have measured the distance they have been whirled from 1929 or 1914 and have counted the weary miles that must be traversed in the march back to the simpler pattern of community living then considered the American way. Others have measured the same distance and have calculated how much of it is a gain on the march toward a newer, better, if admittedly a more complicated, pattern of living for American urban dwellers. What is undertaken here is only to review in the most general terms what is to be found in detail in the rest of the volume, and to measure the distances traversed in 1934. I suspect that these distances will be found to be measures on courses that are neither all backward nor all forward, neither all to the right nor all to the left. The currents of a whirlwind set in all directions.

At the beginning of 1934 the principal municipal task was that of making buckle and tongue meet; the immediate fiscal problem overshadowed all others. During the year the financial position of municipal and other local governments improved. Budgets were balanced, credits were improved, interest rates were reduced, payroll arrears were caught up, forced pay cuts were restored, tax collections improved and tax delinquencies decreased as the tax strikes faded from the picture. In the process of achieving this improvement, which of course was not universal, the cities as governments, to an extent never before known, co-operated with each other; and sought, as never before, the co-operation of state and federal governments.

With respect to the services rendered to their people, the improvement was not so marked. Curtailments deemed necessary for fiscal reasons were continued; expansions required by changing conditions were not made. With respect to the services cut or abandoned, there was improvement in the field of health work, but schools, libraries, and recreational services were not able to cope with the increased demands made upon them. The employment of relief workers permitted some markedly successful efforts to catch up with arrearages in municipal housekeeping, but in this field much depended upon the wisdom of planning and the skill of administration, both of which varied widely from community to community. Under the compulsion of events, local governments in many instances inaugurated genuine economies which saved money without reducing essential services, and the gains in this respect seem to be spreading and to count for permanent improvement.

These things have given rise to an awakened and for the most part intelligent interest in the field of planning and of personnel. It has been discovered in many a city hall that to spend money wisely and get the most good out of a dollar, not only must the work be planned, but the persons who are to carry out the plans and spend the money must possess—beyond mere honesty and good intentions—adequate capacity and training for their jobs. Hence we find discussion of municipal affairs not so completely concerned as it used to be with the functional affairs of public works, public utilities, public safety, public welfare, administration of justice, education, recreation; not even so much with the new and emergent functions of relief and housing; but more and more with those staff activities upon which all the functional divisions depend—finance, planning, and personnel.

To meet the requirements of the newer thinking and the newer talking (one of which may or may not proceed from the other), more attention than ever before has been given to the problems of administrative organization, the allocation of functions among the several levels of government, the relations of local governments to other local authorities and to state and federal governments, and the incidence and types or kinds of taxation. It is not easy in this connection to generalize with respect to results. There have been advances and retreats; some of the gains have been the result of choice and some of necessity, and the same thing is true of the losses. And what makes the problem more difficult is in some instances to determine whether an observed change is a gain or a loss. Internal administrative reorganizations for the most part have been in the direction of more centralized responsibility and more sharply defined division of duties, a trend proceeding both from economic necessity and from the deliberate choice of informed leadership.

The reallocation of functions among the levels of government appears to follow the course of necessity as measured by the ability of the chosen unit to find the funds to support the activity, with the debate whether the changes are good or bad still raging furiously and unresolved.

Municipal governments continue to battle with counties and school districts for the control of the diminishing revenues from the general property tax, each asserting its utter independence, while all of them seek aid from state and federal agencies; state governments reassert their sovereign independence and sole responsibility for life within their borders, while at the same time seeking to disown responsibility for their local governmental sub-divisions and demanding greater aids from Washington: the federal government is accused of despotic purposes because it pours money into the states and communities, and also because it insists in sterner and sterner terms that states and localities raise their own money for these same purposes. The confusion is the greater in these matters because most of us continue to think and talk in terms of that mutually exclusive compartmentalization which assigns to each level of government its particular and inviolate realm, ignoring the trend of thirty years toward co-operation in action, a trend that has risen suddenly and sharply in the depression years.

The hope for clearing this confusion may be based, perhaps, on the observable fact that the responsible governmental officials are working together through their professional and other organizations as never before; that as a result of this work more of the required facts are becoming available to a greater number of those who require them; and that the enforced acquaintanceship of local, state, and federal agencies in common undertakings may introduce a new habit and a new terminology of co-operation. Urban communities may be able to learn a lesson from the co-operative enterprises carried on in rural counties under the county agent, who in one person is an official of county, state, and federal governments, and who symbolizes a vertical integration of administrative responsibility that parallels the vertical responsibilities of citizenship which none of us can escape. Every American citizen is a citizen of the United States, of some state and of some local government. His interests as a citizen indicate co-operation rather than wrangling warfare among the three governmental levels which his taxes support and to which he must look for those social services and community protections that government alone can afford him. That these changing relationships among the levels of government constitute the most important problem now facing American cities is implicit in practically every chapter of this volume, although more explicit discussion, to say nothing of resolving this problem, awaits the future.

That local governments, particularly municipal governments, will become more rather than less important in the whole scheme of American life cannot be doubted by one who looks over the scene and observes the trends of the times. There are a few among us who, their eyes intent upon only a single facet of the emerging crystallization, would have us believe that because cities have more and closer relationships with the states, and new and all but unheard of relations with the federal government, they are about to be engulfed in some new nationalized and amorphous body in which their identity will perish with their independence. It seems to me that such a conclusion, be it fear or hope, is untenable to one who will look at the whole picture, much of which is clearly outlined in this volume. If there is to be national planning for the utilization of natural resources, it will be drafted through state planning agencies and carried into execution in detail by local governments. If there is to be a national program for economic security, it will be under standards set by the federal government operating through the state governments and carried into execution in detail in the cities, and through the co-operation of the municipal governments. If there is to be a national scheme for works and relief, it will require the decentralized administration that only local governments can give it, if it is to succeed in its objectives. And so on, through many programs, one sees the new course of the new currents that will tend to force co-operation, which will not only leave the local governments intact but endow them with new responsibilities and new rights. Nevertheless, for the immediate future we probably will go on with our discussions and debates in the old terminology, and there will be much bitterness, much recrimination, many mistakes and many failures, before we will find a tolerable new pattern of relationships that we can accept.

The future of local government will be written in succeeding issues of THE MUNICIPAL YEAR BOOK, I dare predict, less and less in terms of city *or* school district *or* county; more and more in terms of city *and* school district *and* county: less and less in terms of city *or* state *or* federal government; more and more in terms of city *and* state *and* federal government. We march forward to a more perfect Union.

## ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

BY JOHN B. BLANDFORD, JR.

*Co-ordinator, Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tennessee*

FROM the viewpoint of administrative organization the local government field during the past year revealed a healthy restlessness and an experimental temper. While no striking innovation emerged, many cities and counties sought better organization along traditional lines. Internally, governmental units continued to centralize in terms of departments and responsible executives although advocacy of administrative boards for certain functions persisted. Externally, governmental units explored new avenues of consolidation and co-operation. A sampling of this activity will serve to illustrate the trends.

*Internal Organization.* Rather complete governmental reorganization took place in at least five municipalities in 1934. The coming into effect of the council-manager plan in Elmira, New York, resulted in the elimination of the board of police, board of fire commissioners, welfare commissioners, board of public works, and board of park commissioners—all these departments being made responsible to the city manager. Elmira also abolished the board of assessors, transferring its functions to the appointed assessor and deputy assessor, and grouped all departments dealing with the functions of public safety under a commissioner of public safety responsible to the city manager. The new city manager of Clifton, New Jersey, effected a complete reorganization, reducing the number of city departments to four departments—public safety, public works, public welfare, and finance. Norristown, Pennsylvania, reduced the number of city departments from twelve to five as follows: public safety, public works, municipal property, health, and finance. In Morgantown, West

Virginia, the offices of city engineer, superintendent of streets, and superintendent of sanitation were consolidated under the direction of the city manager. Administrative responsibility was effectively integrated in the Los Angeles city school district when the superintendent was designated as the chief administrative officer with all lines of authority running directly to him and from him to the school board. Previously, the superintendent's authority had extended only to instruction and there were three other staff officers responsible for business management, who reported directly to the board. At least sixteen other cities effected partial reorganization by consolidating and regrouping departments. In April, 1934, the voters of Chicago approved a measure consolidating twenty-two park districts into one metropolitan district called the Chicago Park District to be governed by a board of five commissioners, appointed by the mayor, with overlapping terms. This reorganization abolished a large number of independent boards and restored to the city administration control over the three large park districts which had previously been vested in the state governor and the circuit court judges. Chicago also eliminated its department of licenses and transferred license functions to a bureau in the comptroller's office.

Gardiner, Massachusetts, consolidated its water, sewer, and highway departments into a department of public works. Sheboygan, Wisconsin, followed the same procedure, while Stevens Point, Wisconsin, combined police, fire, and inspection departments in a department of public safety. Shreveport, Louisiana, co-ordinated its city and county health activities by merging the city and parish health boards. The departments of police and fire were combined into a department of public safety in Pensacola, Florida, and Westbrook, Maine. Ashland, Kentucky, combined the public works and city engineering departments; Mount Vernon, New York, the park and engineering departments; and Long Beach, California, the public service and city engineering departments. Freeport, New York, transferred the functions of its purchasing agent to the city clerk. Lincoln Park, Michigan, made the city comptroller the city assessor, and Yonkers, New York, combined the city treasurer's and city comptroller's offices in the department of finance. Appleton, Wisconsin, transferred the functions of its building inspectors and street commissioners to the city engineer, and Springfield, Ohio, transferred the functions of its director of public works to the city engineer and the superintendent of water works. In Scranton, Pennsylvania, the functions of the superintendent of ashes and garbage and superintendent of highways and sewers were combined in the office of a general superintendent. Norwood, Ohio, merged its public safety and public service departments.

A large number of cities continued the tendency to abandon boards and commissions for the administration of municipal activities. The cleanest sweep took place in Indiana where the legislature abolished by statute the board of public works and the board of public safety in all cities over 3,000 population. The functions of these two boards were transferred to an ex-officio board composed of the city comptroller, city engineer, and city attorney in second class cities; the mayor, city engineer, and city attorney in third and fourth class cities; and the mayor, city attorney, and a member of the city council in fifth class cities. The elimination of these two boards thus became effective in 82 cities. The same statute combined the offices of the city clerk and the city treasurer in all cities with a population of 3,000 to 20,000.[1]

In addition to the Indiana cities, at least ten other cities abolished boards and commissions. The reorganization in Elmira, New York, has already been noted. Stamford, Connecticut, abolished all boards and made the department heads directly responsible to the mayor. Muskegon Heights, Michigan, transferred responsibility for its fire and police departments from a council committee to the city manager. In New York City five borough park departments were abolished, and one city-wide department established, headed by a commissioner in place of the old park board. Baltimore, Maryland, substituted a department of welfare for its supervisors of city charities. Charlottesville, Virginia, replaced its welfare board with a welfare director, and Collingswood, New Jersey, replaced its board of health with a health director. Police commissions were eliminated in Central Falls, Rhode Island, and Vincennes, Indiana; and Staunton, Virginia, abolished its park board.

Despite these evidences of a tendency to do away with boards and commissions, an opposite trend was apparent in twenty-five municipalities which established boards and commissions during the year. However, only nine of these boards and commissions were established on a full-time basis for the administration of line activities. A charter amendment in Alameda, California, removed the directors of the police and fire departments from the supervision of the city manager and placed them under an elected commission. The same amendment made the board of public utilities elected instead of appointive. Riverside, California, also amended its charter to abolish the police and fire departments, which were under the supervision of the mayor, and to replace them with a board of police and fire commissioners consisting of the mayor and four other officials, with complete control over these functions. Recreation boards were created in Dayton, Ohio; Santa Monica, California; and Inglewood, California; and park boards in Lorain, Ohio; Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; and Missoula, Montana. Sheboygan, Wisconsin, established a harbor commission, and New York City created a zoning board.

---

[1] *Indiana Acts of 1933,* Chap. 233.

Students of public administrative organization will not applaud these changes toward boards for administration. However, support for a board form of administration for certain functions is still substantial. During 1934 the American Institute of Park Executives and the American Library Association each resolved in favor of administrative boards for their respective functions.

Fifteen other cities appointed boards either for the administration of quasi-judicial functions or on a purely advisory basis. Boards were established for the control of alcoholic beverages in East Orange and Orange, New Jersey, and Washington, D. C. City planning commissions were established in Everett, Washington; Provo, Utah; and Winchester, Virginia. Hamtramck, Michigan, appointed an advisory board to the mayor, while Lincoln, Nebraska, established a public health advisory board. Cleveland Heights, Ohio, created a civil service commission; Quincy, Illinois, an airport commission; San Diego, California, a juvenile aid committee; Yonkers, New York, an electrical control board; and Buffalo, New York, a board for the administration of emergency relief. Woonsocket, Rhode Island, appropriated a substantial amount to a new board whose principal function was to be the stimulation of industry.

Several cities experimented with new departments of activity. Centralized purchasing agencies were set up in Racine, Wisconsin; Santa Monica, California; Wichita, Kansas; Ames, Iowa; Ashland, Kentucky; and Lackawanna, New York. New York City furnished an example of centralized responsibility with decentralized administration. A new bureau of district health administration was created by the city health department, which functions through thirty official districts with an average population of 200,000 each, the boundaries of which correspond with census tracts, thus facilitating the compilation of vital statistics. A full-time district health officer with the necessary administrative, nursing, and medical personnel was assigned to each district. New York also established a municipal housing authority during the year, a bridge authority, and a central purchasing department.

Baltimore, Maryland, established a bureau of assessments to take over all essential functions of the court of tax appeals. Hartford, Connecticut, established a research department in the city hall for a trial period of one year. Long Beach, California, for the first time appointed a city accountant and budget control officer and established a central auto equipment division. Sheboygan, Wisconsin, set up a central dispatching office for all city-owned motor equipment. Charlottesville, Virginia, created a department of recreation, and the voters of Cheltenham, Pennsylvania, established by referendum a department of ash and rubbish collection.

*External Relations.* Perhaps the most important aspect of administrative organization is the effort being made to redefine areas of operation for governmental units and to reassign functions. Los Angeles County voters took a definite step toward governmental simplification of the metropolitan area by giving the county government authority to perform certain municipal functions for any city within the county by entering into mutual agreements. Of forty-four incorporated municipalities within the metropolitan area of Los Angeles, thirty-five have abandoned local assessments for taxation and have delegated that function by contract to the central agency of the county tax assessor's office. A similar number of cities have elected to do the same with tax collections. Thirty-six incorporated municipalities have discontinued local health administration in favor of centralized control through the county health department. This was also accomplished by contract. The voters of the city and county of Milwaukee in November, by a three-to-one vote approved two proposals for city-county consolidation, providing for the consolidation of all municipal services and governments under one controlling body. The result is not binding, and future action will be determined by the local board, the state legislature, and the voters of the entire state. The Virginia legislature has authorized any two or more counties, cities and towns to enter into agreements concerning the acquisition, construction, maintenance, and operation of public improvement projects.

While local governments have been evolving plans for co-operation with each other and for simplification of public administration in metropolitan areas the subject of organization has taken on a new dimension. The federal emergency program of public works, housing, relief and employment measures inevitably has produced new contacts between federal, state, and local government agencies. Appraisal of this experience may be premature but at least the desirability of perpendicular exploration of local, state, and federal layers of government is established. The Tennessee Valley Authority operations ultimately may throw further light on the problem. Here is a federal agency carrying on a program in an area embracing parts of seven states and working co-operatively with states and local governments on navigation, flood control, disposal of surplus power, road relocations, regional planning, erosion control, health, and many other programs. The legislatures of Tennessee and Alabama have recently passed several acts further defining these relationships and facilitating the execution of the program. In this approach to the study of administrative organization an interesting guidepost is the office of the county agent whose program and finances derive from federal, state, and local government sources.

# PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION*

## By Clifford N. Amsden

*Secretary and Chief Examiner, Los Angeles County Civil Service Commission*

Trends in the establishment and administration of the merit system in 1934 were of conflicting nature. Discouraging developments in certain jurisdictions were overbalanced by elements of progress in other areas and by significant national developments of outstanding import. The hearings held in all parts of the country by the Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel which culminated in the publication of a summary report and a series of monographs early in 1935 sounded the keynote for a renaissance of the public interest in the merit system which is essential to effective personnel administration. Early in the year, the National League of Women Voters adopted the merit system as one of two planks in an extensive two-year program of publicity and education. To cap the climax the Civil Service Assembly, meeting in Chicago in October, determined to revive its full-time secretariat, which has been defunct since 1931, with headquarters to be established in connection with the Chicago group of organizations of public officials. Thus personnel technicians and administrators prepared themselves to meet the demands of renewed public interest with a continuing organization for the sound development of technique.

The report of the Commission of Inquiry[1] blazes new trails for personnel administrators to follow in order to vitalize the public service for constructive achievement. It is proposed to establish broad career services on all levels of government in which there will be unlimited opportunity for advancement on the basis of merit to top posts of distinction in the service. The career services outlined in the report correspond to the five broad types of governmental work—administrative, professional, clerical, skilled trades, and unskilled trades; entrance would be restricted to the younger age groups; and recruitment would be more intimately geared in with the educational system than at present. Recruitment would be based primarily on capacity rather than on knowledge and experience which would necessitate the development of comprehensive training programs to orient young recruits in the service. The objectives announced by the Commission for the American public service represent a goal worthy of striving for. In a large measure, public personnel agencies in this country are not ready to take over the program as a whole. Technical staffs remain undeveloped in many jurisdictions; traditional classification procedures must be revised; attitudes and concepts toward the public service must be modified to conform to the broad implications of the program; and this last admonition holds true for public employes, educational institutions, and the general public as well as for personnel administrators. But personnel officers welcomed this militant statement of principle as a challenge to public administrators and law-makers which it would be fatal to ignore.

---

* Court cases relating to personnel administration will be found in the article on "Administrative Law," this Year Book, p. 45.

[1] *Better Government Personnel.* McGraw-Hill, New York, 1935.

With this ideal held before the nation as a counter action against spoils politics, notice must be taken of the menace of the spoils system which still persisted in certain jurisdictions in 1934. Partisan inroads on the federal civil service, particularly in the new federal agencies, were mimicked on a smaller scale in more than one state where there was a party turnover for the first time in many years. In contrast was the action of California which incorporated the merit principle, previously enacted in statute, in a constitutional amendment approved by popular referendum and covering the entire state service. Cities were not immune from the ravages of partisan spoils politics during the year. A civic survey of personnel administration in Illinois state and local governments revealed that "spoils politics has ham-strung the merit system in all of the Illinois governmental units in which it is now nominally in operation."[2] This observation could be echoed in other quarters. Louisiana continued the process of divesting its cities of home rule by establishing a state civil service commission composed of ex-officio state officers, with full authority to appoint and dismiss all members of municipal fire and police departments. But all was not black on the municipal horizon. Massachusetts extended civil service provisions to various city governments by a dozen or more acts passed in 1934. New York City's Fusion administration jacked up the tone and morale of the entire city service under the auspices of the first competent and non-partisan civil service commission to be appointed in that city in some years. Most city managers continued to consider the application of the merit principle an essential factor in the professional and effective administration of municipal functions.

Municipal personnel agencies continued in 1934 to handle large volumes of routine work on curtailed budgets.[3] Technical advances were few largely because of the lack of a national secretariat devoted to research and field work, which will be remedied in 1935 as already noted. Among the more notable accomplishments was the completion by the research division of the United States Civil Service Commission of a police adaptability test as a substitute for the Army-Alpha test in measuring the qualifications of policemen. This test was standardized by trials in a number of sample cities and has been used with excellent results in Berkeley, California; Cincinnati, Ohio; Dallas, Texas; Fargo, North Dakota; New York City, and a number of other cities.

---

[2] *The Merit System in Illinois*, prepared for the Joint Committee on the Merit System by Joseph Pois, Edward M. Martin, and Lyman S. Moore. (Chicago, 1935.)

[3] Leonard D. White, "What the Depression Has Done to Municipal Personnel," *Public Management*, XVII, 17-20 (January, 1935).

The development of more extensive training programs continued during the year. Eleven state municipal leagues conducted short training courses for selected groups of municipal officials.[4] The Virginia League held police and fire schools on a zone basis throughout the state which reached over 1,500 firemen and nearly 1,000 policemen. The annual police training school directed by Chief O. W. Wilson of Wichita was again sponsored by the Kansas League. The New York State Conference of Mayors continued to develop its already comprehensive training program. The Michigan Municipal League inaugurated a series of regional fire schools which were attended by approximately 1,200 firemen.

The development of group training on the job was not matched by an equal interest in the individual training of young apprentices. However, the Detroit Civil Service Commission established a classification of "student employee" to be recruited by competitive examination from four local colleges and universities. Students of more than average ability were thus enabled to secure three or four months of valuable training during vacation periods which served to qualify them for a more permanent appointment after graduation. These students were used mostly on the Commission's own work. City officials of Kalamazoo, Michigan, cooperated with Kalamazoo College by taking three students into the city hall where they are engaged directly in municipal research. Dallas, Texas, has classified the position of apprentice and has brought several young college men to the city hall. The apprentice experiment also has been tried with success in Berkeley, California. But according to a survey of 69 cities made by the International City Managers' Association in 1934, only seventeen cities have taken apprentices during the past three years. Curtailed budgets and council opposition to "hometown jobs for outside boys" have militated against the practice of an idea which is widely accepted as sound in theory.

Personnel administrators were interested in 1934 in the almost mushroom growth of credit unions among municipal employes. These organizations, managed on a cooperative basis, offer opportunities for systematic saving of small amounts and for loans to members at low interest rates.

---

[4] The section of this YEAR BOOK devoted to the activities of state municipal leagues indicates the classes of officials reached by each program.

A survey made by the Farm Credit Administration indicates that several hundred municipal credit unions are now in existence and municipal officials report that such unions invariably proved a stimulus to the morale of the employe by relieving him of small financial worries.

The critical condition of many municipal pension funds was brought into the open during 1934. The New York State Conference of Mayors completed a three year actuarial study of all fire and police retirement systems in effect in New York cities. Pension funds in every city studied were found to be actuarially unsound, although municipal employes in New York other than fire and police have the advantage of participating in a strictly actuarial system administered by the state comptroller. A valuable contribution to pension literature published during the year was Rowland Egger's *The Retirement of Public Employees in Virginia.* This study, inspired by the questionable status of municipal retirement systems in Virginia, contains a mine of information concerning pension theory and practice in all parts of the country.[5]

Personnel administration kept its head above water during 1934 but under the spur of awakened public interest and with the anticipation of constructive research and field work on the part of its national secretariat looks forward to a year of more sustained progress in 1935.

---

[5] For current data on municipal retirement systems see this YEAR BOOK, pages 210 to 221.

## FINANCIAL PLANNING

### By C. E. RIGHTOR

*Municipal Service Department, Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., New York City*

THE factors affecting financial planning set forth one year ago in the MUNICIPAL YEAR BOOK continued in general to guide planning during 1934. The problems confronting our cities include those of default or careful financial direction to avoid a financial breakdown, emphasis upon the cash budget and movement of cash rather than merely budget balancing, financing the cost of unemployment relief, the pay-as-you-go policy, and so on—matters of current budgetary procedure rather than long term improvement budgets. Progress was reported by cities in various aspects of financial procedure, but inadequate revenues and other financial handicaps are by no means uncommon. Capital outlays have been disposed of largely in local budgets by providing for the city's portion of the cost of PWA-financed projects, usually through bonds but sometimes by current revenues. As the year closed, cities were again busily engaged in revising ambitious lists of projects to be financed from federal funds for unemployment work-relief.

Probably foremost in its effect upon the finances of municipalities during 1934 was the enactment by Congress in May of the Municipal Debt Readjustment Act to be operative for an emergency period of two years. This act permits any municipality, with the consent of 51 per cent of its creditors, to petition the federal bankruptcy court to readjust its debt, the final plan, when approved by the court and 75 per cent of all classes of creditors, being binding upon all creditors. In arguments before the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee the problem of preserving municipal credit for necessary future financing was held to be of national importance. At that time its proponents generally agreed that some communities might require a scaling of interest or even of principal. But in actual refunding operations compromise of any debt charges has been rigorously opposed, although granted in some instances. The terms of the act have proved to be too severe for practical application, only a few isolated smaller places including some drainage and irrigation districts having applied to the federal court. Its chief value appears to be that of serving as a deterrent upon a recalcitrant minority of bondholders, who under its threat have yielded to a reasonable adjustment plan. The original sponsor of the measure will seek a revision by Congress of the proportions of creditors required to file a petition for bankruptcy and for approval of a final plan.

The number of communities in default at the close of 1934 was greater than one year ago. An analysis by *The Bond Buyer* reported 2,716 counties, municipalities, and other taxing districts in forty states, as compared with 2,048 local units in default on March 1, 1933. Of the known defaults, nearly 700 are drainage and other special districts, the remaining 2,000 being counties and municipalities of which more than one-half are communities having less than 5,000 population. In the aggregate these defaults involve but a relatively small proportion of the total municipal debt of the nation (estimated at less than 5 per cent of a debt of $19,000,000,000). Their volume and trend, however, indicate the importance of refunding operations in the immediate future.

Refunding plans have been worked out for about one-third of the larger cities that were in difficulty, and have become operative in Detroit, Miami, Grand Rapids, Greensboro, Raleigh, Toledo, Flint, and various smaller places, particularly in the dozen states where defaults are predominant. The record in a few states is "defaultless," due to conservative planning in the past, while in others it has improved through recently enacted laws governing borrowing and budgets.

Detroit's refunding of $280,000,000 of its $390,000,000 debt was the largest of all programs adopted. It provided that all bonds payable from taxes until 1943 should be exchanged for new 30-year callable bonds at the same interest rates, and all tax bonds maturing after 1943 should be exchanged for new bonds with the same maturities and interest rates; temporary debt was funded into 28-year bonds; a portion of the water and street railway bonds were not refunded; unpaid coupons and part of the first two years' interest were funded; bonds held by the sinking fund were cancelled; sinking fund payments were deferred for two years; whenever the annual appropriation for operating costs exceeds $40,000,000, the sinking fund is to receive an amount equal to the excess; and the city paid approximately $800,000 as the expense of refunding.

Miami refunded all of its outstanding bonds and past due interest. For the principal an issue of 30-year callable bonds with the same interest rates was exchanged; interest coupons were exchanged for 2 per cent certificates of indebtedness due in 1947; interest over 3 per cent for the first two years on the new bonds is to be paid by similar certificates; it was stipulated that a fixed minimum tax levy should be levied each year, and that the sinking fund might be used to buy bonds or certificates.

Grand Rapids refunded all general and special assessment bonds maturing prior to April, 1937—$4,583,000 of a total debt of $13,260,000—by an issue of 20-year callable bonds at the same interest rates. Flint conducted its own negotiations in exchanging $2,045,000 general and assessment bonds for 15-year callable sinking fund bonds bearing the same interest rates; $161,000 interest coupons were exchanged for 3 per cent registered serial notes with final maturity in 1942; the program included a drastic curtailment of operating costs and a tax levy for the floating debt.

Greensboro in 1932 agreed with its creditors upon a refunding plan by which all serial maturities from 1933 through 1936 and bond anticipation notes—a total of $6,850,000—were exchanged for the same amount of 25-year 6 per cent callable refunding bonds. Within one year the city found it necessary to revise the plan; first, by increasing the amount of serial bond maturities refunded; second, by graduating the interest rate from 4 per cent for 2 years, 4½ per cent for the next 3 years, 5 per cent for 15 years, 5½ per cent for 3 years, and 6 per cent for the final two years, an average of 5 per cent; third, by permitting purchase by the sinking fund of refunding bonds at market not exceeding par; and fourth, by reducing the interest rate on non-refunded debt to 4 per cent for 2 years, deferring the balance for 3 years. The city handled all negotiations.

Raleigh compromised on a previous plan whereby instead of refunding all bonds due the next 5 years, the refunding was restricted to bonds maturing prior to June 30, 1936, with the approval of the Local Government

Commission. Bonds issued were 15-year callable sinking fund bonds, and it was provided that the annual sinking fund levy must equal at least one-fifteenth of the original principal amount.

Toledo, with the approval of the State Bureau of Inspection of Public Offices, refunded $3,312,000 of general and assessment bonds defaulted in 1933 and 1934, issuing 5 to 15-year 4½ per cent serial bonds. It was agreed that collections of delinquent taxes and assessments should be applied only on debt service, and that operating costs should be at a minimum.

The refunding plans consummated or now under consideration present a wide diversity in the manner of handling the problem, sound principles of public finance being waived in some instances for political expediency. A growing sense of tolerance shown by creditors in recent plans is fortunate, for the straitened finances even now of many communities, as well as the economic principles involved, justify or require compromise before "bearable" conditions are restored. A sane approach to the problem is outlined in the refunding policies drafted by the Florida League of Municipalities. There is evidence that too many hard-pressed cities, in order to meet their existing debt schedules, have reduced personnel and salaries, unduly neglected upkeep of their physical properties, and deferred a proper annual charge for capital outlays—practices that cannot be continued indefinitely in future budgets. Appraisal of a community's debt paying capacity requires broadmindedness and an understanding of the importance of current municipal services.

The causes of the defaults of recent years retreated further into the background during 1934—such as bank failures, tax delinquency, unbalanced budgets, inability to borrow money, and necessity of financing relief locally. Thus cities generally are reporting a stronger current position, due somewhat to their own efforts but more as a result of external influences.

Tax collections, for example, were as a whole slightly improved over 1933, as indicated by the third annual compilation of these data by F. L. Bird. His analysis shows a delinquency for 1934 levies of only 23.8 per cent in 145 cities over 50,000 population, compared with 26.3 per cent one year ago or an improvement of 2.5 per cent. The accumulated reservoir of delinquencies, plus Home Owners' loans, accounted for most of the improvement in cash position.

An invaluable contribution to the field of experience in tax collection was the report on *Current Tax Delinquency* released by the Census Bureau in the summer of 1934. This study, made under the direction of Lent D. Upson, covers the levies for 1932-33, and contains, in addition to the detailed figures on levies, collections and delinquencies, a summary of the tax collection laws of each state with the changes since 1930.

Bond sales by states and municipalities during the year, as reported by *The Bond Buyer* totaled $1,174,481,000, exclusive of $546,577,000 short-term loans; this figure was $46,905,000 larger than the previous year, and involved 4,647 issues as compared with 2,516 the previous year. Of the total long-term loans, $273,346,000 represents loans made by PWA and RFC, the corresponding figure for 1933 having been $484,362,000. The 1934 sales were the largest since 1931, but are lower than the average of the ten years prior to the depression, while the $277,000,000 represented by refunding operations is a substantially larger portion than in prior years except 1933.

The bond market strengthened steadily through 1934, reflecting the improvement in general economic conditions both in the nation and among municipalities as well as an increase in the supply of funds seeking tax exempt investment. *The Bond Buyer* index for 20 large cities reported a record high yield averaging a 3.83 per cent interest basis on December 19, the highest since June, 1931, when the yield was on a 3.74 per cent basis, as contrasted with 5.69 per cent in June, 1933.

Budget planners were again confronted with the problem of providing revenues for emergency relief; first, to decide upon the amount needed; second, to estimate the probable revenue from the state and federal government; and finally, to determine whether to finance the local portion by taxes or bonds. Until the FERA completes its survey of the relationship between the federal government and each state, followed by a determination by the state of the manner of financing its relief, the cities must continue this extra-budgetary item without a fixed policy or adequate planning.

As the states have come to the aid of the cities in bearing relief costs, so are they also easing the tax burden upon real property generally. In some cases the voters have accepted the popular but specious pleas of the national real estate boards for tax limitation by writing it into the law. There is in fact no substitute for enlightened control of public expenditure. Tax limitation invariably results in a scurry for other revenues, as the reductions in yield cannot be offset fully by reductions in operating costs and debt charges. Municipal budgets are being cast with attention to new revenues, particularly the sharing of state-collected taxes such as sales, income, gasoline, liquor, etc., and also the transfer from the local budget to other units of government of a growing portion of the cost of relief, road construction and maintenance, education, courts, and so on.

The states, in turn, in assuming this financial burden are exercising an additional supervision and control over local administration, including review of budgets, limitation upon borrowing, economy through consolidation, etc.—a responsibility properly resting with the state. An example of legislation under which several cities in New Jersey have regained financial stability is found in Chapters 60 and 233, which enables cities to refund their current and bonded debt, provided they agree to operate upon a cash basis and let the state auditor approve their budgets.

Most, if not all, of the forty-seven legislatures that met in 1933 enacted laws relating to local finances, the effects of which were first felt during 1934. Examples are legion of the ever-increasing leniency toward payment of taxes, limitation of levy, and reduction in the tax base; while on the other hand much of the legislation enacted was concerned with reforms in collection machinery, new taxes and other sources of revenue, reduction of expenses, consolidation of districts, revision of borrowing limitations and refinancing, and state supervision of the finances of local subdivisions. The net result of these laws, amendments, and court interpretations undoubtedly has been to strengthen the financial position of municipalities.

Prominent among the statutes enacted were those broadening the powers of municipalities to benefit from the national program of public works and to simplify the procedure and extend the power for financing public improvements.[1] An example is the extension of the authority form of government in New York, Pennsylvania, and California,[2] and between states, as New York and New Jersey. Several state courts held that obligations issued by an instrumentality of the state such as a university, do not constitute indebtedness of the state, as in Georgia and Montana.[3] Extension of the use of municipalities of revenue as against tax obligations was significant legislation in several states, greatly extending the development of sound enterprises through PWA funds, as in Illinois, Iowa, Mississippi, New Mexico, and South Carolina.[4] Numerous court decisions have decreed that special fund bonds do not constitute a debt within the

[1] *New York Laws of 1933*, c. 782, revised by *New York Laws of 1934*, c. 104; *New Jersey Laws of 1933*, c. 328, revised by *New Jersey Laws of 1933*, c. 416 and C. 428; *New Mexico Session Laws*, Special Session of 1934, c. 6.

[2] For the Triborough Bridge Authority see *New York Laws of 1933*, c. 145 and for other New York authorities *New York Laws of 1933*, c. 89, and 246, and *New York Laws of 1934*, c. 300, 138, 162, 304; *Pennsylvania Laws of Special Session, 1933-34*, 114, validated by *Tranter v. Allegheny County*, 173 Atl. 289 (Pa., 1934); for California Toll Bridge Authority see *California Statutes of 1929*, c. 763 discussed in *California Toll Bridge Authority v. Kelly*, 281 Cal. 7, 21 Pac. (2nd) 425 (1933).

[3] *State v. Regents of University*, decided by Supreme Court of Georgia July 28, 1934, No. 10365 (unreported); *State ex rel. Veeder v. State Board of Education*, 33 Pac. (2nd) 516 (Mont., 1934).

[4] *Smith-Hurd Revised Statutes of Illinois*, 1933, c. 24, secs. 440-446 and 490 h-r, as amended by *Laws of 3d Spec. Session, 1933-34*, p. 128 and p. 141; *Iowa Code of 1931*, secs. 6134-dl as amended by *Ex. Sess. Laws of 1933-34*, c. 74; *Mississippi Laws of 1934*, c. 316 and 317; *New Mexico Laws of 1933*, c. 57 as amended by *Laws of 1934*, c. 4; *South Carolina Acts of 1933*, Act 299 as amended by *Acts of 1934*, Act 798.

meaning of any constitutional limitations, as in Florida, West Virginia, and elsewhere.[5]

The remarkable improvement evidenced in financial planning by New York City during the year, made possible by the election of a fusion administration, must be referred to. The results during a single year were phenomenal—it is only to be deplored that the voters cannot know all the facts. The city balanced its budget and ended the year with a six million dollar surplus; lowered operating costs; adopted new special taxes to finance 25 per cent of its emergency relief; improved collections of both current and delinquent taxes; reduced the number of employees from 90,798 to 86,364, exclusive of schools and courts; furloughed its employees including teachers, court, and county employees; sold long-term bonds for the first time in three years; borrowed short-term money at lower interest rates than ever before; reduced its debt; obtained favorable amendments to the bankers' agreement relating to the budgetary reserve for tax delinquency; published a weekly and monthly statement of financial position; extended central purchasing; and keyed up civil service administration. New York City unqualifiedly ranks first among all cities in its record of achievement in financial planning.

Active support of local governments in putting their financial houses in order was given by the Investment Bankers' Association through its research and strengthened standards of investment. The Association promulgated a questionnaire on the financial status of cities, revised and expanded after consultation with the Municipal Finance Officers' Association. The form now calls for the chief data needed in appraising a city's credit, including tax levies and collections, permanent and floating debt, etc. Recognizing the importance of effective tax collections to municipal credit, the Association has aggressively supported "pay-your-taxes" campaigns. Forgeries of municipal securities became so common that a special committee studied the problem, offering several practical suggestions to overcome this difficulty.

The accomplishments of the National Committee on Municipal Accounting and its promise for the future of financial planning, reviewed elsewhere in this YEAR BOOK, must be noted. It promises much for the future, too, to note that such great universities as Harvard, Princeton, Pennsylvania, New York, and Wisconsin have recently announced courses of training in governmental finance and administration.

[5] *In Re Opinions of Justices*, 152 So. 901 (Ala., 1934); *Smith v. Town of Guin*, 155 So. 565 (Ala., 1934); *State v. City of Miami*, 152 So. 6, (Fla., 1934); *Indiana Service Corporation v. Town of Warren*, 189 N. E. 523, (Ind., 1934); *State of Kansas ex. rel. Boynton v. State Highway Commission*, 32 Pac. (2nd) 493 (Kan., 1934); *Young v. City of Ann Arbor*, 255 N. W. 579 (Mich., 1934); *Gilbert v. Traverse City*, 255 N. W. 585 (Mich., 1934); *City of Houston v. Allred*, 71 S. W. (2nd) 251, (Tex., 1934); *Wadsworth v. Santaquin*, 28 Pac. (2nd) 161, (Utah, 1934); *Brewer v. City of Point Pleasant*, 172 S. E. 717, (W. Va., 1934); *Casto and Shinn v. Town of Ripley*, 173 S. E. Adv. Op. No. 6, (W. Va., 1934).

# MUNICIPAL BUDGETING

By A. E. Buck

*Staff Member, Institute of Public Administration, New York City*

During 1934 municipal budgeting was influenced to a marked degree by two developments. One was the increased financial support from the national government for certain city activities, and the other was the more extended supervision by state governments over local financing.

Municipal budget makers found it necessary when preparing their budgets to take into account the federal public works and relief programs, and to plan desirable local projects for approval by the national government. When these projects were approved and federal support assured, the city authorities agreed to a limited supervision through reporting, inspection, and otherwise. To this extent they were regarded, at least in some sections of the country, as surrendering the local autonomy of their governmental units, a matter however that did not seem of any special importance in the face of a national crisis.

Through general legislation of one kind or another state supervision of municipal budgeting has been extended in various parts of the country. California limited its cities to a 5 per cent increase in their budgets over the previous year, unless the local authorities first obtained the consent of the state board of equalization. While this measure is of a temporary character, it is expected to continue for two or three more years. West Virginia gave the state tax commissioner rather extensive control over city budgets during 1934, the exercise of which incurred the displeasure of some city officials. Colorado required uniform preparation of budgets in all of its municipalities. Kentucky did the same for its counties and made the county treasurer liable on his official bond for any expenditures in excess of budget funds available. Louisiana gave its state budget committee full control over all local school budgets even as to the appointment of teachers. New Jersey enacted legislation to relieve the municipalities of that state from having to provide for financing the total deficit incurred during one fiscal year in the next succeeding year, permitting as much as four-fifths of this deficit to be carried over to a later period. This measure proved ineffective, so much so that Governor Hoffman recommended the enactment of a law to put the municipalities on a cash basis, allowing them to spend only the amounts actually collected rather than the amounts levied.

As a matter of fact, during 1934 there was a definite trend toward a cash basis in municipal budgeting. The balancing of the city's cash income against its cash outgo seemed to be the watchword of financial advisers. And interestingly enough, city authorities in many sections of the country accepted this dictum of the advisers. In some instances they went even a step further by regarding appropriations as being merely authorizations to spend if and when funds were actually in hand. For example, the Duluth city charter now provides that the city may spend only 80 per cent of its tax levy and 80 per cent of its miscellaneous revenues until a greater sum has actually been collected. This proved to be a severe but rather effective method of balancing the municipal budget.

Popular interest in budget hearings seems to have increased considerably during 1934.[1] A number of city managers scattered throughout the country reported attendance at budget hearings ranging from ten to 800. At these hearings, the manager, or the finance director, or both, were present to answer questions. Charts were frequently used to explain revenue estimates and expenditure requirements and to show comparisons with previous years. In some cities these charts were posted in the lobby of the city hall both before and after the budget hearings.

Budgetary practices in certain cities have not been very commendable during 1934, in spite of widespread efforts to improve financial planning in municipalities. The city authorities of Philadelphia were taken to task by the local Bureau of Municipal Research for their inflated estimate of receipts. The Bureau claimed that such an estimate enabled the city council "to authorize a greater amount of expenditures on any given tax rate than could be authorized under a genuine estimate," thus enabling "the city to operate on 'credit,' meaning on a fictitious basis, putting off to the future the burden of current expenditures." This practice, the Bureau asserted, was unsound, and a vicious and dangerous sort of gambling. The Civic Research Institute of Kansas City, Missouri, has been equally severe in its criticism of the authorities of that city. It maintained that the city council did not observe the budgetary provisions of the charter. The budget was not acted on at the designated time, the appropriations were not properly made, and necessary control over expenditures was not enforced. The Institute claimed that the expenditures made by the major departments of the city government ranged from 37.5 to over 46 per cent of the total appropriations for the fiscal year when only one-third of that year had transpired. The budget methods of New Orleans were termed "medieval" by the local Bureau of Governmental Research. This organization stated that the city's budget was full of unexplained items, without supporting or interpretative information. "To obtain a satisfactory picture of the budget," it said, "is impossible. All one can get is a worm's eye view of small bits of it."

---

[1] Cf. *Public Management* XVI, 301 (October, 1934).

But several cities of the United States have maintained satisfactory budgetary standards even under the trying conditions of the depression. In some instances the city authorities have been able to improve their budgetary methods as a result of their financial experiences. The budget of Dallas, Texas, continues to be one of the noteworthy documents of its kind in the country, especially in its supplement which contains organization charts and detailed summaries of work programs for each department. It may very well serve as a model in form and presentation for the larger cities of the country. Certain smaller cities have made important changes in their budgetary procedure during 1934. The newly established budget director of Long Beach, California, for example, devised an improved method of preparing the city budget, which calls for a statement by each department of its work program for the year according to major activities listed in the order of their importance, indicating the authorization for each activity, and containing a brief report of each activity for the past year. This method is expected to give Long Beach its first genuinely informative budget. The town of Greenwich, Connecticut, also inaugurated a new budgetary procedure, and with the aid of a citizen budget committee produced a very comprehensive and informing budget document. Officials of similar units of government should find this document quite illuminating as to form and presentation.

## TAXATION AND ASSESSMENTS

By Philip H. Cornick

*Staff Member, Institute of Public Administration, New York City*

Court decisions, legislative acts, administrative rulings, and the reports and resolutions drafted by public agencies and civic bodies, indicate that during 1934 public opinion was in a state of turmoil concerning that element in our tax system which for more than a century has provided not only the major part of the revenues required for the support of local governments but also a substantial part of the revenues of state governments. Of the many cross currents now evident in popular and official thinking on the subject, some are clearly the logical developments of the evolutionary processes which have been at work for decades in improving both the theory underlying the property tax and the processes by which it has been administered. Others can be explained only on the theory that powerful and well entrenched groups are seeking immediate advantage for themselves without taking into account the ultimate costs of that temporary advantage either to their own interests or to those of the social group as a whole. Still others seem to arise from the well-meaning but naïve cogitations of economic illiterates who happen to be gifted with a flair for stating false syllogisms convincingly.

*Installment payments of taxes.* Chief among movements which are clearly the outcome of long run evolutionary tendencies is the rapid rate of growth in provisions for payments of property taxes in installments. This movement has been in progress for many years and has been greatly stimulated as a result of the depression. Closely related to the statutory changes looking toward this end which have been made within the past few years, are the unofficial steps taken by banks, sometimes with official sanction and cooperation, for tax clubs handled along the lines developed earlier in connection with the so-called Christmas clubs and vacation clubs. Accounts opened under these plans have the advantages of introducing great flexibility into tax payments and of providing in effect the equivalent of discounts as an incentive to prepayment.

*Tax penalties.* In the same category, we have a decided movement toward change in the long established scales of penalties on tax arrears. While this movement also has its roots in the past, the effects of the recent changes have frequently been the reverse of wholesome. In the state of New York, for example, the tax sale provisions in the so-called general tax law, which remains applicable today only in certain suburban and rural towns, contained a heritage from the depressions following the Civil War in the form of a penalty at the absurdly usurious rate of 37½ per cent. In the current depression that rate has been reduced to 20 per cent—certainly a step in the right direction but one which hardly went far enough. At the same time the city of New York shifted its own penalty rate upward to 10 per cent, and one of the smaller municipalities took steps to abate for a limited period all penalties on arrears of taxes paid within that period. These examples drawn from one state can be duplicated in a number of other states. They are indicative of the confused state of current thinking on both the purposes and the effects of tax penalties.

The Michigan legislature provided during the year for the payment of delinquent taxes for the year 1932 and prior years on a ten-year installment basis beginning with the year 1935, which resulted in the postponement of the annual tax sales which would otherwise have been held. New Jersey enacted a statute permitting the extension of unpaid taxes into twenty quarterly installments, with the result that tax sales of property owners who accept the plan are suspended so long as they meet the installments when due.

*Tax limitations.* Tax limit laws provide similar examples of confused thinking. They seem to be an almost inevitable by-product of depressions. They rest on the assumption that public expenditures at any given moment can be lowered arbitrarily to any desired point wholly without regard to what went on in the past. They ignore not only the fixed charges but also the hardly less rigid costs of operation and maintenance growing out of public improvements programs which are now accomplished and indubitable facts. They overlook the standards of service in the fields of education, health, welfare and safety which have become firmly embedded in public opinion, in modes of life, in statutes, and in some cases in constitutions. They forget the new burdens which the depression itself has imposed on governments—the necessity of providing for those who, through no fault of their own, are deprived of the opportunities to earn their own livelihoods. In state after state, the minorities who worked unwittingly but indefatigably to ensure high tax burdens in the future—in that future which has now become the present—seem to have joined hands with the formerly inert majorities who gave no thought to what governments did beyond accepting the benefits of their activities, in order to impose limits on governmental expenditures out of revenues for any and all purposes whatsoever.

In each locality the proponents of tax limitation seem to consider the device as something which they themselves have invented. The widely publicized tribulations of the cities of West Virginia following that state's overwhelming vote in favor of a tax limitation amendment seems not to have minimized the enthusiasm with which the citizens of the neighboring state of Ohio embarked on a similar adventure. This is all the more strange in view of the fact that even during the boom, Ohio had struggled unsuccessfully with the Smith one per cent law, and had but recently made the statutory limitations less rigorous. There is a fine irony in the fact that the voters of Ohio, having succeeded by statute in reducing current expenditures from revenue during the boom, and in thereby increasing expenditures out of borrowings based on future revenues, should now during the depression endeavor to reduce by a constitutional limitation the level of current tax burdens which are due in part to the former statutory limitation.

In other states, agitations for constitutional tax limitation are in progress—in New York and Illinois, for example, which contain the first and second cities in the land. It is to be hoped that the brilliant and timely special report of the Illinois Tax Commission which deals with the problems of constitutional tax rate limitation in that state, and endeavors to forecast its probable effects on selected units of local government, will serve to lay the specter of tax limitation in that commonwealth.

A survey made by the Illinois Municipal League in 1934 showed that a large number of Illinois municipalities were levying less than the legislative tax limit in effect in 1933, while those that were levying more than the limit were doing so only after approval of the rate by popular referendum. This indicates that local governments do not always levy the limit of what they can get.

*Trends in tax collections.* The progressive and alarming decline in the percentage of property tax levies collected within the year of levy, which began even prior to the collapse of the boom in 1929, seems to have reversed itself. This change in trend is not yet apparent in the most recent available compilations of comprehensive statistics, except in some of the Florida cities, and in a few of the smaller cities which draw their business largely from agricultural areas. For example, the voluminous report on *Realty Tax Delinquency* issued in 1934 by the Bureau of the Census indicates clearly that, for the country as a whole, current collections continued to decline, and cumulative arrears to mount during the entire period covered by that study. The latest years for which data were included in that study, however, were 1933 in some areas, and 1932 in others.

Newspaper dispatches and recent data on isolated and piecemeal studies here and there throughout the country indicate, however, that a decided change for the better took place in many regions in 1934. A larger percentage of current levies was collected than in 1933, and the volume of arrears collected mounted encouragingly. New York City, for example, collected about 79 per cent of her current levy in 1934. In addition, she collected also more than one half the accumulated arrears of 1933 and prior taxes. The combined collections of current taxes and arrears represented an amount equivalent to 104 per cent of the levy placed in collection in 1934.

In the suburban counties adjacent to New York City a similarly encouraging situation prevails. In twelve municipalities in one county for which the writer has compiled figures, current collections for 1934 represented 78 per cent of the levies for 1934, and collections of current taxes and arrears together reached a figure equal to 98 per cent of the 1934 levy. This is all the more remarkable in view of the fact that these municipalities had increased their aggregate levies for 1934 by almost one-eighth over those for 1933, the purpose being to place themselves on a cash basis in 1934 by providing a "cushion" for uncollectible taxes. The combined collections in current taxes and arrears during 1934 reached an amount equivalent to 110 per cent of those lower aggregate levies for 1933—levies which, incidentally, provided more generously for the current costs of operation and maintenance than those for 1934. In six of the twelve municipalities, furthermore, collections of current and overdue taxes together amounted to more than 100 per cent even of the 1934 levies, including the substantial "cushions."

Memphis, Tennessee, made a substantial improvement of the tax collection record during 1934 by launching an intensive campaign during the process of which newspapers, handbills, radio, and public speeches were used to emphasize the importance of paying taxes. Placards were placed on public buildings and city-owned vehicles and bills were delivered to delinquent taxpayers by city employees. If a delinquent property owner was not living at the property described his address was obtained from the tenant, with the result that notices were then mailed to the persons who were directly responsible for the payment of taxes.

Less complete figures from many other sections of the country tend to buttress the conclusions implicit in those which have been cited, namely, that tax collections are improving. The precise reasons for the improvement can only be guessed at. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation has no doubt been an important factor. More important still, and in the long run more salutary in its effects, is the progress which has been made through normal business channels in the reorganization of the financial structures of bankrupt apartment houses and office buildings. General business recovery is a third factor. Changes in collection procedure, especially those in the direction of enforcing the priority of tax liens over all other charges against property, are also exercising a profound influence on the rate at which current and delinquent taxes are being paid in some states. In a few states the property tax still continues to be what it has always been in those sections—a voluntary contribution which a property owner makes to the support of government if he happens to be in funds and feels like paying. If he doesn't pay, he can't be disturbed in the possession and enjoyment of his property. In the states where that condition still prevails, it is not probable that the conclusions based on the figures cited are applicable.

Tax receivership laws as a means of collecting delinquent taxes were administered with considerable success in Illinois, and New Jersey; and Ohio followed the lead of these two states by enacting a similar statute in 1934. Recent figures indicated that under the Illinois law the county treasurer of Cook County was operating 718 income-bearing parcels of property, and the treasurer reported that delinquent tax collections were almost three times as great during the twelve months after the receivership law became effective as in the year preceding. Tax receipts are reported to have more than doubled in Jersey City since the beginning of action against tax delinquents under a New Jersey act which permits tax collectors to sue to be made receiver on any property on which taxes have been delinquent six months or more.

County treasurers in Kansas who for many years have been paying over to local taxing units 100 per cent of the taxes levied, including special assessments, whether the taxes and assessments have actually been collected or not, were relieved of this burden by the state supreme court which held that the county treasurer had no authority to pay the taxing unit more than the amount actually collected, and that the county treasurer could not withhold tax money collected to reimburse the county for overpayment the previous year, but that the county could recover from the taxing unit the amount so overpaid.[1]

It is certain that some states have continued to hamper the collection of municipal revenues. For example, New Jersey municipalities, which collect taxes for school districts, special districts, the county, and even state taxes of certain types, continued to be legally bound to pay 100 per cent of all levies to other jurisdictions, regardless of actual collections, with the result that they have either built up sizeable floating debts to these other units of government or they have been paying 100 per cent with disastrous effects on their own budgets. Legislative bills proposed during 1934 to permit these cities to pay only amounts proportionate to actual collections failed to pass the legislature. In West Virginia, the responsibility for municipal tax collections was vested in 1934 in the county sheriff, who in a number of cases either failed or refused to remit promptly, with the result that city officials have been unable to secure by force monthly settlements of municipal funds.

*Valuation of property for taxation.* During 1934 the taxable values of real estate continued to decline in many areas. There is little doubt that assessors for taxes and commercial appraisers alike are doing more hard thinking today on the problems of their tasks than ever before in the history of our country. It is too soon to say that new methods of valuation have as yet emerged. There can be little doubt however that for some time to come the evidence as to values provided either by market prices for lands, or by reproduction costs new for buildings, will be subjected to closer scrutiny than in the past.

The pioneers in the establishment of the so-called science of assessments—notably Lawson Purdy in New York, and W. A. Somers who laid the foundation for the Cleveland system—early emphasized the need for testing computations made on the basis of prices and costs by estimates based on income or on other factors. Unfortunately, one effect of the boom was to mask the necessity for income analysis. Not only among the newer converts to systems of assessment, but also in the offices where the foundations for those systems were laid, the tendency during the boom was to follow the great majority of commercial appraisers in placing chief reliance on prices and building costs. As soon as gross and net incomes from real estate stabilize sufficiently to make such a course possible, there can be little doubt that those factors will assume a place of greater importance than ever before in the computations on which taxable values are estimated.

---

[1] *Nemaha County v. City of Seneca,* 138 Kansas 895; *Greenwood County v. School District,* 139 Kansas 297; *Harvey County v. School District,* 139 Kansas 457; *Woodson County v. City of Yates Center,* 139 Kansas 519.

Constitutional amendments were adopted during the year by Florida and Louisiana, exempting homesteads from taxation. The Florida amendment exempted the heads of families from all taxation "other than special assessments for benefits" on homesteads up to a valuation of $5,000, while the Louisiana amendment provided for the arbitrary reduction of the assessed valuation of the homestead by $2,000. The probable effect of these two amendments is unknown because of the ambiguity in language of the Florida amendment and because there is no provision in the Louisiana amendment which guarantees an actual reduction in values.

*Special assessments.* Special assessments as a source of municipal revenues have declined steadily and markedly in importance since 1928. The volume of receipts from that source in 1932 among cities of 100,000 or over, as reported by the Census Bureau was only about one half as great as in 1928. Figures for 1933 and 1934, when they become available may indicate a reversal in the downward trend. If so, it will be attributable in large part to the artificial and temporary stimulation of assessable public improvements through the medium of loans by the Public Works Administration.

Speaking generally, it is probably safe to say that during the next generation expenditures from special assessment receipts will not again reach the level they had attained in 1928. The extravagant heights reached at that time were the outgrowth of boom conditions. The peaks established in that respect during earlier booms were not again attained until the succeeding booms were well under way. With the growing emphasis on control over land uses, and on the limitation of the purposes for which, and the areas within which special assessments may be resorted to, it may well be that even during future booms the heights of extravagance in the use of so-called benefit assessments, which were reached in 1928, will never again be equalled.

# MUNICIPAL REVENUES

By Simeon E. Leland

*Member of Illinois State Tax Commission*
*Professor of Economics, University of Chicago*

Depression millstones finely ground the municipal fiscal grist during 1934. All of the chaff and even much of the bran continued to be removed. Although taxpayers and their pressure groups did not seem as eager for further reductions in municipal expenditures as in 1933, many budgets continued to be curtailed. On the other hand, numerous cities restored the pay cuts previously adopted. Moderate price increases during the year enhanced somewhat the cost of normal operations. Relief burdens, likewise, increased in many quarters, although the percentage of total contributions made by localities for unemployment relief were not as great as in 1933. The relief burdens borne by states noticeably decreased during 1934, while the percentage of costs paid by the federal government rose steadily. In eleven states almost the entire relief burden was carried by the federal and local governments. In California the national government contributed $48,414,827 or 72.4 per cent of the relief costs, while the localities paid $18,370,269, or 27.5 per cent for this purpose. The contribution of the state was but $45,054. In Indiana the federal and local contributions to relief were $20,787,263 and $10,668,874 respectively, while the state government raised only $20,489. In Massachusetts the same situation prevailed. Federal contributions for relief were $40,198,200; local funds amounted to $32,619,625; the state paid only $148,986 as its share of the load. In Wisconsin the state contributed only $167,928 for relief in comparison with $8,209,834 from local governments and $30,563,643 from the federal government. Other examples of the same tendency could be cited. Out of the total relief costs in 1934 of $1,479,339,603, the federal government carried 72.3 per cent of the burden, the state governments 12.6 per cent, and the communities 15.1 per cent. Not all of the states, therefore, can be criticized for passing relief burdens on to local governments with their limited sources of revenue. And, as the year was ending, the national government announced that the future support of the unemployables would probably be left to the localities, with the cheering news that they (this group) constituted only 20 per cent of the 19,000,000 on federal relief. Additional relief costs thus face local governments.

The failure to develop anything like an equitable distribution of relief burdens among the various levels of government continues to be an example of the lack of unity in the structure of American governments. Each set of units concerns itself with its own problems, its own activities, its own fisc, unmindful of consequences inflicted upon other governments or its obligations to them. During 1934 American governments continued their traditions of independence and indifference—the 175,000 units still need to be welded into a co-ordinated, if not unitary, functioning agency. It still needs to be realized that the units exist to serve rather than to be served *per se.*

The revenue problems of municipalities were also complicated by declining valuations and proposals to limit tax levies. Some of the reductions in assessments were due to actual reductions in property values, others to the tardy action of officials in bringing assessments into line with actual values, and still others to curtailments in the tax base wrought by legislation or constitutional amendment. Among the latter should be noted the adoption of homestead exemptions. Florida adopted a constitutional amendment exempting from taxation all homes with a value of $5,000, which it has been estimated will reduce city tax levies for operating purposes about 25 per cent. Louisiana adopted a similar exemption of $2,000 from *state* taxes only, the deficiency in revenue, of course, to be made up by the increased taxation of those not in the subsidized class, or by reductions in state expenditures—the latter an unlikely contingency. These measures have, in general, been sponsored by the proponents of tax limitation schemes as a dual measure of relief from the "high" property taxes, blamed for the collapse of real estate speculation. If these measures achieve their purpose the "home" market and the price of homes is supposed to improve. These arguments and the general rebellion against high taxes spread somewhat the extent of tax limitation schemes, statutory and constitutional, during the past year. Among the states adopting tax limitation measures were Oklahoma, and Louisiana (permanent improvements in overlapping districts). Washington strengthened its previously adopted 40-mill plan. Seven Michigan cities (Flint, Muskegon, Muskegon Heights, North Muskegon, Grand Rapids, Pontiac, and Saginaw) embraced a 15-mill plan although some of them by charter were legally exempt from the operation of any state plan. The city of Kalamazoo defeated a similar proposal. Cincinnati and Los Angeles County also refused to accept the delusions of the tax limitation advocates, as did the voters generally in Oregon and Colorado. In West Virginia, where a limitation plan had previously been adopted, the operating revenues of cities continued to be curtailed approximately 47 per cent. In Washington, where a 15-mill limit on city levies is effective, a survey of 1935 tax levies in 55 cities indicated that the levies for current expenses of 38 places approximated 15 mills and that all but three cities had total levies (current expenses and debt) of 15 mills or over.

All of the above factors, and many more, have accelerated the search and seizure of new or additional revenues for municipal purposes. Almost every untaxed thing that could be found was somewhere taxed. Imposts of various kinds were applied to utility bills, utility franchises, theater tickets, slot machines, punch boards, billboards, newspaper advertising, motor vehicles, gasoline, liquor, etc. Renewed efforts were directed in Virginia at non-residents who come into the state (or city) to get laundry business or build post offices, emphasizing that resentment over the itinerant peddler evidently has not ceased. Seattle imposed a 3 per cent gross income tax on its private competitor selling electricity and was sustained by the United States Supreme Court. Municipal sales taxes were imposed by a number of cities the most notable of which is New York. That city earlier was authorized by the legislature to adopt any tax which the legislature itself could impose. Under this power a 3 per cent tax on gross receipts of public utility corporations was enacted. This city likewise imposed a tax on inheritances equal to 40 per cent of the state tax and on incomes equal to 15 per cent of the federal income tax. In addition there is a general business tax based on gross receipts for 1934, alone an exemption of $15,000, taxable at one-half of one per cent and a tax on financial business equal to one-fifth of one per cent on this 1934 gross income. There is a likelihood that these last mentioned taxes may be repealed.

These levies on inheritances and incomes by the city of New York are the most outstanding events in the field of municipal finance for the year 1934. They are in the nature of surcharges upon state and federal taxes. There have in the past been some instances of state taxes based upon federal taxes, as for example, the corporations tax in Connecticut and the South Carolina income tax, but this is the first time to the knowledge of the writer that a municipality has employed federal legislation and administration to make effective local taxes. In executing these taxes the city maintains its own administrative staff. Sometime in the future, perhaps, state and federal fiscal policy may be so shaped as to contemplate the more general adoption of these surcharges. Then the major units may execute their taxes, collect the surcharges, and remit the amount of the local levies. The possibilities of the surcharge may be more thoroughly explored in America now that New York has furnished the precedent.

An *increased demand* for the sharing of state taxes and a demand for *increased sharing* of state taxes was voiced by municipal authorities throughout the past year. Cities in many states asked for portions, or greater portions, of gasoline tax collections, and motor vehicle license receipts, to cite but two examples. Washington and Michigan to a degree granted these requests. Ohio shared a portion of its 3 per cent sales tax with cities and other local units. On the other hand, a large part of the burden of the diversion of motor fuel and vehicle revenues from highway to other uses has in some places deprived municipalities of the use of their share of these funds for highway or general uses. The diversion of a portion of the gasoline taxes in Illinois to relief has practically deprived the city of Chicago of its share of this tax. Of course, the funds diverted help defray the costs of relief in the city so that nothing is really lost except the control of the city over the expenditure of the funds. Political life, however, is made up too often of squabbles over such rights. The cities seem more interested in sharing in the funds for relief, highway or other purposes than in complaining about diversions of these tax monies. The road contractors and auto lobbies can attend to that.

No account of revenue trends in 1934 would be complete without a statement that during the year tax collections improved and tax delinquency decreased. These improvements are attributable more to a slight betterment in business conditions, to the consummation of federal loans, to the gradual extinction of private debts and to the improvement of banking and credit facilities rather than to increased diligence on the part of tax collectors. The reduction in taxes, the use of installment payments, the availability of discounts, and the results of public education have also contributed to the improvement.

## MUNICIPAL ACCOUNTING

By Carl H. Chatters

*Executive Director, Municipal Finance Officers' Association, Chicago*

The outlook for adequate municipal accounting improved during 1934. The National Committee on Municipal Accounting was organized, several cities installed unit cost accounting systems, and other cities adopted machine accounting. State-wide groups became interested in municipal accounting and reporting, and many smaller communities substituted modern methods for antiquated ones.

The activities of the National Committee on Municipal Accounting represent the most important development in municipal accounting in the last decade. The project is carried on co-operatively by the professional accounting societies and national organizations of public officials and citizens. The Committee has published bulletins relating to the principles of municipal accounting and audit procedure. Uniform accounting terminology was developed by a special subcommittee. This material was made available in tentative form early in 1935. Standard forms of balance sheets and explanations of the various municipal funds were prepared. Forms of financial reports will be recommended. The tentative standards already determined will be submitted to the test of actual practice for a period and then revised. The committee plans an extensive campaign in 1936 to promote into general use the standards it has developed.

The Municipal Finance Officers' Association made a study of accounting practices in 223 cities, most of which had populations in excess of 30,000. Only 113 of these cities were using accounting machines for any purpose. Two cities over 500,000 population, two with populations between 300,000 and 500,000, and twenty-one between 100,000 and 300,000 were not using accounting machines at all. Only 135 of the municipalities were recording encumbrances against appropriations. The survey showed that many cities with sufficient volume of work were not making use of mechanical accounting methods.

During the year, however, machine accounting installations were made in several cities. Louisville, Kentucky, installed punch card machines for general accounting and other purposes. Topeka, Kansas, made an installation for budgetary control. Ashland, Oregon, also purchased an accounting machine. For the first time, the city of New York is now preparing its payrolls by accounting machines, at an estimated saving of $50,000 per year. Many public officials who are convinced that machine accounting is necessary say they hesitate to take the step because present employees would be forced from their positions.

Progress has been made by the smaller cities. Five of them in Kentucky substituted modern accounting methods for their old and out-of-date records. Two accounting manuals were prepared and published by the League of Minnesota Municipalities, one for the very small communities which could maintain only cash records and another elementary set of records on a double entry basis for the slightly larger municipalities. The Colorado Municipal League made installations of its uniform system in eight places.

Budget control became a matter of increasing importance. The city of Long Beach, California, appointed a budget officer who has installed excellent control procedure. Baltimore, Maryland, started the publication of a comprehensive report relative to the budgeted receipts and expenditures. Other communities, realizing the necessity of maintaining expenditures within income, strengthened their budgetary control procedure.

State-wide groups became interested in the improvement of municipal accounting. The municipal leagues of California and Florida appointed special committees to deal with the subject. Several state societies of certified public accountants, including those of New York and Idaho, appointed special committees on municipal and governmental accounting.

The cities of Vermont were brought together by the state chamber of commerce and the city officials themselves are sponsoring a bill for uniform accounting and reporting.

The Connecticut Special Tax Commission made a report dealing largely with municipal debt, budgets, and accounting. The recommendations pertaining to accounting are of general interest:

1. The budget-making authority of each municipality should appoint a chief accounting officer.
2. The chief accounting officer should hold office during the pleasure of the budget-making authority.
3. No person should serve concurrently as chief accounting officer and treasurer.
4. Two or more municipalities should be able to appoint a *joint* chief accounting officer.
5. The chief accounting officer should prescribe all accounting forms and procedure, except where limited by the state tax commission.

The necessity of having a uniform fiscal year for all municipalities was stressed. Legislative bills to enact into law the committee's recommendations were presented to the General Assembly.

The necessity for audits by independent accountants became more widely recognized and accepted during 1934. Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, completed its first audit in 135 years of existence. Ashland, Oregon, had its first audit made since its incorporation. The practice of awarding municipal audit contracts on the basis of competitive bids drew increasing condemnation from both public accountants and public officials. Several accounting societies refused to continue the practice and would not submit proposals on a competitive basis.

All future New Jersey applicants for the certified public accountant's degree must take a one day examination in municipal accounting. Those who desire only to be "registered municipal accountants" can take the special one day examination given to candidates for the C.P.A. certificate. Kansas legislation proposed a municipal accounting board to aid the state accountant in designing and approving uniform municipal accounting systems and in licensing municipal accountants.

The year 1934, as far as municipal accounting was concerned, then, has been characterized by a national movement for the development of standards, by a disclosure that even the larger cities have not made adequate use of modern accounting methods, by some progress in the installation of mechanical equipment, by state movements for the improvement of municipal accounting and auditing, and by improvements in the personnel engaged for municipal accounting positions.

# PUBLIC PURCHASING

By Russell Forbes

*Commissioner of Purchase, City of New York*

During the year 1934 the governmental purchasing agent has been compelled to steer a course between Scylla and Charybdis. On one side he has had to avoid wrecking the ship of state by paying prices which would exhaust the budget and cripple the operation of governmental institutions. On the other side he has had to avoid a collision with the "New Deal" efforts to raise prices as a means to national recovery. Verily, it has been a year that taxed one's soul.

The activities of a public buyer are about as confidential as those of a goldfish. For the protection of the taxpayer against collusion between the buyer and the seller, all bids submitted are public records. Whereas states and counties and the Federal government are exempt from the price provisions of the majority of the codes of "fair" competition, cities are in the same class as private corporations. To effectuate the enforcement of filed prices, "modal costs," "determined costs" and other preventatives of price-cutting, a Government Contracts Branch has been established by the NRA, and it concentrates its efforts on municipal orders and contracts.

During the entire year a series of battles has been fought with code authorities and with the NRA in behalf of fairer treatment for governments. In these battles the United States Conference of Mayors and the American Municipal Association have rendered conspicuous service, and those organizations have received most consistent and effective aid from Joseph W. Nicholson, city purchasing agent of Milwaukee, chairman of the Governmental Purchasing Group of the National Association of Purchasing Agents, and one of the leading public buyers of the country. Piles of official records, tabulations of bids and other documentary proof have been submitted at conferences to show that price-fixing and collusion are rampant in several industries, notably those governing the sale of fire hose, steel furniture, and lumber and other building materials. Since it has been established that the price of fire hose is the same in Los Angeles as in Portland, Maine, and that the unit price is the same for 100 lineal feet as for 1,000,000 feet, the United States Conference of Mayors is seriously considering the possibilities of leasing a fire-hose factory to produce and sell this essential commodity at cost to all cities of the United States. If this greatly needed development is consummated, it will spell another illustration of monopolistic greed having killed the faithful goose that has laid many a golden egg.

The President's Executive Order No. 6767, issued June 29, 1934, provided that any bidder might reduce the price to a government to the extent of 15 per cent below the last price filed with the code authority, and that such reduction of 15 per cent became the new filed price. This order gave considerable relief in some industries. But in other industries, no relief was secured. For example, the petroleum, coal, and soil pipe industries were exempted from the President's order because they were operating either under a separate administrative agency or under an emergency agreement in lieu of a code.

Many of the governmental buyers have been especially belabored during the past year from the additional duties of purchasing materials for work relief projects. This has resulted in greatly increased expenditures for supplies, materials, and equipment, although the "regular" budgets have in most cases been curtailed. The story of increasing prices, the efforts to reconcile rising costs with the imperative necessity of retrenchment in budgetary expenditures, and the effect of NRA codes on this struggle is well set forth, in a manner and to an extent with which this writer would not attempt to compete within this space limitation, by Sherwood L. Reeder in the September, 1934, issue of *Public Management*. To this source the reader is directed for further enlightenment.

During the past year the New York State Conference of Mayors and Other City Officials continued its practice of collecting and distributing to all cities in the state comparative prices paid for a wide range of staple commodities. This helpful and worth-while service is also now being performed monthly by the Virginia and Wisconsin Leagues of Municipalities for the cities of their states. The Wisconsin League has also initiated some experiments in co-operative purchasing on standard specifications following the experiment which has been proved successful and economical in past years by the Michigan Municipal League.

In the year 1934 substantial progress was made in the spread of centralized purchasing to new fields. The buying of materials for all the park districts of Chicago was centralized in a new division. The cities of Racine, Wisconsin, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and Irvington, New Jersey, adopted ordinances which established central purchasing offices. Six cities of Kentucky also adopted centralized purchasing either by ordinance or by informal agreement of the city council. Very little progress was shown along this line in state governments, since very few of the state legislatures were in session during the year. The recently adopted county home rule amendment in Ohio permits centralized buying for those counties that use the amendment.

Considerable progress was brought about in New York City in the program of development of a centralized purchasing system, despite the numerous handicaps under which the department of purchase was forced to operate. An amendment to the purchasing law, enacted by the state legislature in May, added to the powers of the department through transfer of the purchase of printing and stationery from the board of city record.

An ingenious method for determining the savings of centralized purchasing—always a most difficult task—was devised by H. T. Shenefield, director of finance and purchasing for Lucas County (Toledo), Ohio. Each month during the year Mr. Shenefield compared prices paid by his office with the monthly wholesale index of commodity prices for Toledo as released by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. On this basis, it was estimated that in 1932 expenditures were $22,000 above the index prices, while in 1933, with purchasing centralized, the prices paid by Lucas County showed a saving of $33,000 under the price index of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. There must be something in the old saying that centralized purchasing pays.

# MUNICIPAL POWERS

By C. W. Tooke

*Professor of Law, New York University*

In attempting to set forth in a limited compass the significant changes in the law of municipal corporations during the past year, one is confronted with the fact that in no preceding year of our history have there been so many legislative enactments increasing and defining the powers of municipalities. Most of the legislation has been prompted by the social and economic crisis which has called for increased public expenditure on the one hand and a corresponding movement toward retrenchment on the other hand, impulses quite inconsistent and seeming to call for any port in time of storm and stress. It will be some time before much of this legislation can receive judicial construction or be adequately evaluated. In a short article dealing with the work of the courts in this field during the past year, about all one can do is to comment on some of the more important decisions bearing upon a few of the many problems that have come up for adjudication.

Of these decisions, quite naturally the most important were those dealing with financial questions, some of which arose directly in connection with the PWA of the federal government. In the effort to make effective loans to municipalities, those in charge of these activities frequently encountered state constitutional limitations on indebtedness and the lack of statutory power in municipalities to undertake even self-liquidating enterprises. These problems have called for amendments to the statutes in most states and in some instances to the state constitution. This legislation has had to pass judicial approval before the federal authorities felt justified in making the requested loans. The decisions relating to these amendments in the several states during the past year are far too numerous to be reviewed and of course mainly concern interpretations of the local constitution and enabling statutes. Quite generally the "special fund" plan, by which loans are to be paid entirely from the earnings of self-liquidating enterprises and for the repayment of which no recourse can be had to general taxation, has been upheld as excluding such obligations from the constitutional debt limitations. An exhaustive review of this interesting line of decisions up to August of the past year was prepared by E. H. Foley, Jr., and presented before the last annual meeting of the American Bar Association.[1]

Numerous other new problems arising out of the necessities of financial readjustment are now before the courts. Among these perhaps the most controversial is the application of the federal bankruptcy power to local state agencies. The only decision reported to date on the constitutionality of this feature of the Wilcox Bill, passed by Congress last year, was handed down December 1, 1934,[2] in which an irrigation district invoked the remedy provided by the statute. In holding that the petitioner could not avail itself of this provision of the federal bankruptcy act, Judge Kennerly relied mainly upon the premise that the district in question was a subordinate agency of the state of Texas and that the principle of the independence of the state and federal governments in taxing the agencies of each other should be applied. The technical ground of the decision was that no state statute authorized the application. The decision therefore turned primarily upon the lack of power in the local agency to invoke the benefit of the act. The questions whether the legislature could grant such a power and whether under an appropriate enabling act the federal power could be invoked were not passed upon. As the Wilcox Bill is a temporary emergency act and so few local agencies have sought to avail themselves of its provisions, it seems quite probable that this method of financial readjustment will fall of its own weight.

An unusual number of cases have been reported the past year dealing with the legal questions involved in the attempt to reduce the salaries of local officers and the wages of employees. Of course the compensation of employees under contract, and in this category are generally included teachers in the public schools, is protected against impairment by the contract clause of the federal constitution. This clause does not apply to the salary of an officer, but numerous state constitutions prohibit the increase or reduction in the salaries of officers during an existing term. The problem can be and in some instances has been met by the abolition of the office. Several cases in which this expedient was adopted arose the past year in New Jersey, and the courts of that state uniformly held that in the absence of bad faith on the part of the governing authorities no officer could successfully object.[3] If a municipality is given the power to abolish a position in the civil service, no incumbent will be protected against its abolition when required in the interest of local economy.[4]

---

[1] This article was published in I, Fordham Law Review, pp. 13-34. The article includes a review of the status of the special "authority," which may be set up with power to undertake one or more self-liquidating enterprises. This device has also been generally upheld (*Tranter v. Allegheny County Authority,* 316 Pa. 65, 173 Atl. 289).

[2] *In re Cameron County Water Improvement Dist. No. 1* (District Court, Southern District of Texas), 9 Fed. Supp. 103.

In many states, the constitution forbids the reduction of the salary of local as well as state officers during their term of office.[5] In some instances a reduction has been effected by a voluntary waiver of the officer's constitutional right. In a California case it was held that by agreement before entering upon the discharge of his duties to accept a reduction of the official salary and his receipt of the sum agreed upon, an officer would be bound by his contract.[6] But in Kansas, under a similar state of facts, the Supreme Court held such an agreement to be void upon grounds of public policy.[7] Of course in all cases of constitutional or statutory direction as to the exercise of the power to reduce salaries, such provisions must be followed. Thus the constitution of Colorado requires that the salaries of officers be fixed by charter and an attempt in the charter to give power to the local legislature to reduce them during an existing term was held to be void.[8] So, also, salaries fixed by a referendum ordinance cannot be reduced by an ordinary legislative ordinance, unless the charter has been amended in the meantime to confer such a power.[9]

Another interesting question was raised in Minnesota last year as to the applicability of municipal workman's compensation statutes to persons required by public relief boards to perform services. In a Michigan case decided in 1933[10] the Supreme Court of that state had held that such persons were not employees within the purview of this statute. Due to this and similar decisions, the Federal Government has required municipalities receiving federal relief money to provide workmen's compensation insurance as a condition precedent to the award of federal funds. In *Michels v. St. Paul,*[11] the Supreme Court of Minnesota recently affirmed an award of the State Industrial Commission to a workman so employed, holding that under the statute in that state the city was empowered to enter into such a contract and that the workman upon such a relief project may take advantage of the agreement and therefore become for this purpose an employee entitled to compensation under the act.

---

[3] *Donovan v. Bd. of Commissioners of City of Bayonne* (N. J. Sup. Ct.) 175 Atl. 143.

[4] *Leary v. City of Philadelphia,* 314 Pa. 458, 172 Atl. 459; *Livingston v. MacGillivray* (Cal.) 36 Pac. (2d) 622.

[5] *Gillespie v. Board of County Auditors,* 267 Mich. 483, 255 N. W. 388; *County Commissioners of Calvert County v. Monnett,* 164 Md. 101, 164 Atl. 155.

[6] *Myers v. City of Calipatria* (Cal. App.) 35 Pac. (2d) 377.

[7] *Peterson v. City of Parsons,* 139 Kan. 701, 33 Pac. (2d) 715.

[8] *McNichols v. People* (Colo.) 35 Pac. (2d) 863.

[9] *State v. City of Seattle,* 176 Wash. 283, 28 Pac. (2d) 1020.

[10] *Vaivida v. Grand Rapids,* 264 Mich. 204, 249 N. W. 826, Annotated, 47 Harvard Law Review 362. See, also, *Hanson v. St. James Hotel,* 191 Minn. 315, 254 N. W. 4.

The most prolific source of actions against municipalities still continues to be in the domain of tort liability. The greater number of reported decisions the past year has turned upon the application of the artificial distinctions adopted in the given state between so-called governmental and proprietary functions. In Missouri and New Hampshire we find decisions holding that where municipal property serves both functions, liability will be predicated on the negligence of the municipal employees.[12] That no liability will arise from acts clearly *ultra vires* the corporation was reaffirmed in Massachusetts.[13] This principle was also applied in South Carolina where the action was based on negligence in operating a domestic lighting system beyond the limits of the city.[14] In a Louisiana case involving liability to a child injured in a public park, the Court of Appeals, upon a rehearing, held that under the statute vesting control of the park in the New Orleans Park Improvement Association, that board was primarily an agency of the state without power to enter upon any proprietary acts and hence not subject to an action for negligence in conducting a swimming pool, even if substantial fees were charged.[15]

That a home-rule city cannot by amendment to its charter exempt itself from tort liability was reaffirmed by the Texas courts in an action to enforce the common law liability to travelers injured through defects in a street.[16] In rather startling contrast to this generally accepted rule was the decision of a federal circuit court of appeals holding that, under the broad home-rule powers delegated to cities by the Ohio constitution and the provisions of a charter adopted pursuant thereto, the city of Cleveland had power to bind itself by contract to be liable primarily for all damages resulting from the negligent acts of a contractor engaged for a public work.[17] Apparently this question had not been passed upon by the highest court of the state, and the federal court was therefore free to place its own construction upon the pertinent constitutional and charter provisions. In view of the peculiarly broad construction placed upon the constitutional delegation of power to home-rule cities by the Ohio courts, the federal court may have been justified in reaching its conclusion, but the final determination of the interpretation of the powers of the city rests in the highest court of the state.

---

[11] 258 N. W. 162.

[12] *Lober v. Kansas City,* (Mo.) 74 S. W. (2d) 815 (water main serving five plugs and domestic consumers); *Douglass v. Hollis,* (N. H.) 172 Atl. 433 (common way in school house, where part is leased as a lodge hall).

[13] *O'Hearn v. Town of Adams,* (Mass.) 192 N. E. 524.

[14] *Looper v. City of Easley,* 172 S. C. 11, 172 S. E. 705.

[15] *Rome v. London & Lancashire Indemnity Co. of America,* 157 So. 175.

[16] *City of Wichita Falls v. Crummer,* (Tex. Civ. App.) 71 S. W. (2d) 583.

Of statutes affecting liability in tort, the most noteworthy was that adopted by the New Jersey legislature,[18] which further restricted the already narrow range of municipal liability in tort by providing that "no county, municipality or school district shall be liable for injury to the person from the use of any public grounds, buildings or structures, any law to the contrary notwithstanding." This statute seems to have been adopted rather hastily at the behest of the Atlantic coast cities, which were made painfully aware of the duty they were under to the public in their conduct of numerous amusement and recreation functions for hire.[19] On the other hand we should note that the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania has now fully approved of the amended statute of that state imposing liability upon counties, cities, boroughs and incorporated towns for negligence of employees in the operation of their motor vehicles upon the public highways.[20] In this connection attention may be called to the efforts being made in various quarters to formulate legislation which may do away with the existing confusion in this field of the law, based largely upon archaic distinctions, and to substitute therefor a rational method of distributing the losses of persons suffering injuries in connection with the operation of the innumerable functions undertaken by the modern municipality. Those interested in this subject will find a notable article by Professor Edwin Borchard, of Yale University, in the December number of the American Bar Association Journal, in which the problem is fully stated and recommendations for statutory reforms tentatively put forth.

In closing, attention is called to the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States has finally passed upon the much mooted question of the extent of the power of the federal government to tax the income of municipal officers and employees. In *Helvering v. Powers,*[21] handed down December 3, 1934, the Court unanimously held that the salary of the trustees appointed by the state to manage the Boston Elevated Railway system was subject to the federal income tax. This decision is based on the broad principle that the state cannot withdraw sources of revenue from the federal taxing power by engaging in businesses which constitute a departure from usual governmental functions, and to which, by reason of their nature, the federal taxing power would normally extend. It follows that the salaries and wages of all municipal officers and employees engaged in the operation of municipally owned utilities will be subject to a general federal income tax, unless expressly exempted by the federal statute. This decision goes much further than any of the earlier decisions of the Court in defining the limitations of the immunity of state and local officials from federal taxation.[22] The implications of this decision as to the taxation of municipally owned public utilities and the income from their securities go so far as to suggest the probable necessity of amendments to the Internal Revenue Act.

---

[17] *Cleveland v. Baltimore & Ohio Ry. Co.,* (C. C. A., 6th Ct.) 71 Fed. (2d) 89. It may be noted that Colorado as well as Ohio holds that the police power of home-rule cities is conferred directly by the state constitution; *City and County of Denver v. Henry,* 33 Pac. (2d) 895.

[18] *Laws of 1933,* ch. 468, approved January 10, 1934.

[19] See *Martin v. Asbury Park,* 111 N. J. L. 364, 168 Atl. 612, decided September 27, 1933, clearly defining such duty and affirming liability to persons injured through negligence in operation of public bathing pavilion.

[20] *Mallinger v. City of Pittsburgh,* 175 Atl. 525.

This brief discussion omits any reference to decisions, many of them important, dealing with zoning and city planning, the extension of the local powers of taxation, the development of local administrative agencies and the problem of reorganization of county and township government. Some of these topics have temporarily been forced into the background by the pressure of more immediate problems of ways and means to meet the local exigencies of the national emergency. The extension of the police power to zoning and city planning has already been pretty definitely settled, but within the next decade problems of local reorganization, of central supervision of local agencies, of the technique of local administration, will have to be worked out. Most of this work will lie in the field of legislation, but the success of that legislation will largely depend upon its conformity to the constitutional and legal standards which are constantly being applied and developed by the courts of the land.

---

[21] 55 S. Ct. Rep. 171. As to salaries of officers or employees engaged in strictly governmental functions, see *Mallory v. White,* 8 Fed. Supp. 989, (D. C. Mass.) decided November 9, 1934.

[22] The opinion in this case follows the reasoning of the Court in *Ohio v. Helvering,* 292 U. S. 360 (May 21, 1934), which held that where a state goes into business of selling intoxicating liquor, it subjects itself to the federal tax imposed on liquor dealers.

# ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

By Marshall E. Dimock*

*Associate Professor of Public Administration, University of Chicago*

The legal aspects of municipal administration were interesting during 1934 not so much because of any trends which may have been established but rather because of certain outstanding cases, although of course it may perhaps be said that some of these cases did give a hint as to what the trend might be. This summary is limited to four fields, namely, organization, the city manager, officers other than the city manager, and the civil service commission.

*Organization.* The year 1934 witnessed the advancement of the county manager movement, but the advancement was not without its legal hurdles. Outstanding is the case of Henrico County, Virginia. In that county the manager form of government was adopted at an election held in the fall of 1933 pursuant to the county law of 1928. Later, when four new members were elected to the county board of supervisors, the old board refused to vacate and to relinquish the power to appoint the county manager, alleging that their terms were not yet over and that the legislature has no power to shorten the term or vacate the office of any county or district officer, also that the adopted form of government became effective the day on which it was approved by the voters. The legality of the system itself was not attacked. The supreme court of Virginia ruled against the old board on each of its contentions, declaring that the members of the old board knew, when they accepted office, of the possibility of county reorganization.[1] A similar case relating to the adoption of the county executive plan by Albemarle County, Virginia, was decided at the same time when the right of the new county director of finance to hold office was upheld in the face of a contention by the county treasurer under the old plan that the legislature could not shorten his constitutional term of office.[2]

The Arkansas supreme court upheld a statute permitting cities over 50,000 to adopt the council-manager plan under home rule procedure as a proper classification of cities.[3] The statute was attacked as invalid special legislation prior to the election in Little Rock in November on a proposal to adopt the plan. The proposed charter was defeated at this election.

---

* In the collection of cases and the writing of this survey the writer has been assisted by Lewis B. Sims, research assistant, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago.

[1] *Lipscomb v. Nuckols,* 172 S. E. 886 (Va., 1934).

[2] *Haden v. Hamm,* 161 Va. 934, 172 S. E. 891.

[3] *Knowlton v. Walton,* 75 S. W. (2d) 811.

Municipal reorganizations which led to court action occurred in three cities. The mayor and council of Baltimore passed an ordinance creating the bureau of control and accounts and permitting non-civil service persons to be appointed. The court passed quickly over this aspect of the case, holding that the council did have the right to alter the organization of the city government and to authorize appointments from without the classified service.[4] The supreme court of New Jersey upheld the authority of Hackensack's city manager to remove a fire chief by consolidating the positions of the fire and police chiefs in a director of public safety in the interests of economy and integrated responsibility.[5] An almost identical situation arose in Florida when the city manager of St. Petersburg attempted to consolidate the positions of his fire and police chiefs in a director of public safety, thereby dismissing his chief of police. This action was taken under authority of the council-manager charter adopted by the people in 1931, but the Florida supreme court held that the police chief was entitled to a full hearing according to provisions of a civil service act adopted by the people in the same year and that he could not be dismissed without the approval of the trial board.[6]

*The city manager.* In the summary of administrative law contained in the 1934 edition of the MUNICIPAL YEAR BOOK, reference was made to the important Kentucky case holding the city manager to be a "public officer."[7] During 1934 there were no specific holdings on this point, but in at least two cases state courts made repeated reference to the city manager as an "officer."[8] It will be surprising if in the future any court declares the city manager to be no more than a municipal "employee." Although the distinction led to an unfortunate result in the Kentucky case, it should not under ordinary circumstances.

The power of the city manager to make contracts and thereby to bind the city presents a very interesting and important problem. After a contractor had proceeded, upon the authority of the city manager and the superintendent of the department of public utilities, to complete some excavating work, the city of Kalamazoo refused payment for services rendered, alleging that the contractor had no authority from the city to proceed to perform the work. The court held that under the provisions of the Kalamazoo charter "only the city commission has the power to make contracts," and then proceeded to say, "The promise of the city manager or other officers did not of itself create an express contract with the city."[9] Of course, if the city manager had no power to make an express contract, he had no power to make an implied contract. This is in accord with the Florida case, which held that contracts made by the city manager of the city of St. Petersburg in the absence of council authorization by ordinance were invalid.[10]

---

[4] *Carey v. Jackson,* 169 Atl. 922 (Md., 1934).

[5] *Ziegler v. City Council of Hackensack,* 174 Atl. 199.

[6] *State ex rel. City of St. Petersburg v. Noel,* 154 So. 219 (Fla., 1934).

[7] *City of Lexington v. Thompson,* 61 S. W. (2d) 1092 (Ky., 1933); see Municipal Year Book, 1934, p. 59.

[8] *Baker v. City of Kalamazoo,* 256 N. W. 606 (Mich., 1934), and *City of Phoenix v. Rodgers,* 34 Pac. (2d) 385 (Ariz., 1934).

Perhaps the most important legal question that arose during 1934 was whether the city council has complete authority to appoint and remove the city manager or whether the courts will assume jurisdiction. The question was considered by the Arizona supreme court in the case of *City of Phoenix v. Rodgers.*[11] In May the city commission of Phoenix removed the city manager "for cause," in accordance with the provisions of the city charter. Upon application to the superior court, Judge Rodgers granted a writ of certiorari, ordering the city commission to desist from further proceedings. The commission, however, immediately appointed a new city manager; whereupon the members were cited for contempt. The supreme court held that the superior court had jurisdiction (a) to issue a writ of certiorari reviewing the proceedings of the city commission in the removal of the former city manager, (b) to order that he be retained as de facto city manager pending the final determination of the writ, and (c) to issue a citation for contempt against the city commission should the commission proceed further than it already had. Said the court: ". . . . Under a charter provision such as that obtaining in the city of Phoenix, it is for the *court* upon certiorari to determine whether any of the charges preferred against the city manager were legal causes for removal and whether there is evidence sufficient to sustain such charges," although the weight of conflicting evidence is left up to the commission.[12] The court also ruled that the interests of the public required the retention of the experienced city manager, as de facto manager, at least until the legality of the commission's action had been determined.

This decision appears to be a blow to the council-manager form of government, because if the system is to work, perfect harmony between the commission and the manager is a *sine qua non,* and the commission ought to have final authority to decide upon the grounds of removal. In the Phoenix case, however, the charter was amended to exclude the "for cause" phrase from the removal power of the council which now has sole authority to remove the manager without review.

[9] *Baker v. City of Kalamazoo,* 256 N. W. 606 (Mich., 1934).

[10] *Brown v. City of St. Petersburg,* 153 So. 141 (Fla., 1933).

[11] 34 Pac. (2d) 385 (Ariz., 1934).

[12] Italics added.

*Officers other than the city manager.* During the past year, city employees separated from the service have found the courts sympathetic. In Grand Rapids, Michigan, the city manager discharged the superintendent of police for "insubordination in office" and for the use of "excessive and unnecessary profanity." On appeal to the Michigan supreme court the superintendent of police was reinstated.[13] In another case it was held that the necessity of reducing expenditures does not constitute cause for removal, nor does preference for a "political friend."[14] When a special committee of three from the Pawtucket board of aldermen conducted an investigation and recommended the removal of the chief of police without giving him an opportunity for hearing, the Rhode Island court held that the three members of the special committee disqualified themselves to sit on the board and pass on their own recommendations; whereupon the removed chief of police was reinstated.[15] The Texas court of civic appeals held that the discharge of several policemen by the chief of police or the city manager of Dallas because their service rating fell below a minimum standard was invalid unless they were given a hearing in accordance with the provisions of the city charter.[16]

Although the former occupants of abolished offices secured redress in two jurisdictions,[17] they were singularly unsuccessful in Pennsylvania. Thus, the case of *Leary v. City of Philadelphia*,[18] involving the separation of 130 patrolmen from the Philadelphia pay roll, may certainly be considered as a "leading case" in municipal administrative law in 1934. The case may also be said to be one of the most unfortunate of the year. Briefly, the facts are as follows: Allegedly as an economy measure, 130 patrolmen were, on the basis of a council appropriation ordinance, discharged from service in Philadelphia by the director of public safety in the final four days of his term of office. Seven of the 130 had perfectly clear records, and one had received the annual award for bravery the previous year. Immediately before this act the director appointed 179 new patrolmen, but not one of these was among the 130 laid off. The civil service commission was given no opportunity to hear the cases. The supreme court of Pennsylvania in a 5-2 decision held that the director of public safety did have full authority to act as he did, that he did not abuse his discretion, and that he was not bound to discharge new appointees in place of veterans. Action on the part of the civil service commission was unnecessary, said the court, because the whole thing was a matter of economy, and the patrolmen were not discharged for cause. Whether the element of personal dislike entered in was held irrelevant; it "begs the question and wholly ignores the facts." If the director made a few mistakes in selecting the ones to be separated from the service, that fact, according to the majority, "only proves that he was a human being. . . ." The two dissenters contended vigorously that the whole matter was nothing but a subterfuge and a pretense, a hurried "padding" of the police force followed by a reduction of the force by eliminating those personally disliked by the director. This, said Justice Maxey, makes the civil service act "just another 'scrap of paper'." From the standpoint of good administration the results in this case are extremely regrettable, and it is to be hoped that they will not be duplicated elsewhere.

---

[13] *Carroll v. City Commission of Grand Rapids*, 251 N. W. 381 (Mich., 1933).

[14] *Ellis v. Holcombe*, 69 S. W. (2d) 449 (Tex. Civ. App., 1934).

[15] *Hanna v. Board of Aldermen of City of Pawtucket*, 173 Atl. 358 (R. I., 1934).

[16] *McDonald v. City of Dallas*, 69 S. W. (2d) 175 (Tex. Civ. App.).

[17] *State ex. rel. City of St. Petersburg v. Noel*, 154 So. 219 (Fla., 1934), and *City of Newark v. Civil Service Commission of New Jersey*, 112 N. J. Law 571, 172 Atl. 589 (1934).

[18] 172 Atl. 459 (Pa., 1934).

Reductions in the salaries of municipal officers, even though acquiesced in by the officers themselves, were held illegal in at least two cases,[19] such reduction being declared to be "contrary to public policy." In a similar case, but a case which involved only employees and not officers, the signing of a donation agreement was declared to be a voluntary act.[20] The use of the word "voluntary" seems a bit strained, however, in view of the fact that the acting finance director of the city, acting under council ordinance, refused to pay the salaries of any of the employees unless all of them signed the donation agreement! To say the least, this was applying persuasive pressure.[21]

One of the most interesting subjects in the field of administrative law is the subject of nepotism. In the little city of Monett, Missouri, a city of the third class, the mayor appointed his first cousin as pumper of the municipal water system. This, it was alleged, was in violation of the nepotism provision of the state constitution, and quo warranto proceedings were instituted to test the mayor's right to continue in office. The mayor's defense was that he was not an "officer of the state or any political subdivision thereof" and that hence the nepotism provision of the constitution did not apply. The Supreme Court of Missouri, however, held—and the United States Supreme Court denied certiorari—that a third class city is a "political subdivision" of the state and that the mayor of such a city is a public "officer." The mayor was ousted from office.[22] For this decision advocates of good government have only words of commendation. In Montana a borderline case was decided the other way, the court holding that where the mayor had appointed an alderman's son as water registrar, said alderman was not precluded from voting to confirm the appointment.[23]

---

[19] *State ex. rel. Knez v. City of Seattle,* 28 Pac. (2d) 1020 (Wash., 1934), holding a fireman to be a public officer, and *Peterson v. Parsons,* 33 P. (2d) 715 (Kan., 1934), involving the city engineer.

[20] *Lehman v. City of Toledo,* 192 N. E. 537 (Ohio App., 1934).

[21] A few cities since the advent of the depression have found themselves unable to reduce the salaries of municipal employees because of the fact that specific salaries were provided for in the charter. The Toledo technique might be applied by such cities, provided they were able to disregard ethical principles as easily as was the city of Toledo.

[22] *State ex inf. Ellis ex rel. Patterson v. Ferguson,* 65 S. W. (2d) 97 (Mo., 1934); cert. den., 291 U. S. 682 (1934).

*The civil service commission.* During 1934 in cases involving the express or implied powers of the civil service commission, the courts evidenced a tendency to take a strict rather than a liberal view of civil service commission powers. For example, a New York court held that the state civil service commission could not exempt persons from examination for appointment as town police officers and approve thereafter their appointment for temporary employment.[24] The California Supreme Court held that the civil service board does not have jurisdiction to hear appeals in cases where a public position has been abolished, even though it may have been abolished in bad faith.[25] In this case the California court said: "The civil service board assumed to try and determine this issue of fraud. The city charter does not confer upon the board such jurisdiction. . . . Abolition of an office or position is not synonymous with discharge from employment . . ."

Neither does the civil service commission possess the power to make its own rules if the effect is to extend its own jurisdiction. Thus, the Ohio Supreme Court ruled that the civil service commission of Cleveland could not confer upon itself further jurisdiction than that conferred upon it by the city charter.[26] "There should be some restriction," said the court, "upon the tendency of boards and commissions to confer power upon themselves under the guise of rules of procedure. . . ." The Denver civil service commission's self-adopted rule, "The appointing officer may suspend the accused for a period not exceeding one month," was held void in that the civil service commission had attempted to extend its own jurisdiction.[27]

From the standpoint of unbiased, unprejudiced administration, the West Virginia decision in *Prichard v. De Van*[28] is a regrettable one. This case, involving the composition of the civil service commission itself, warrants a brief statement of the facts. The West Virginia legislature provided that the municipal civil service commission should consist of three members, one to be appointed by the mayor, one by the local trades board, and the third by the local chamber of commerce. The mayor of Charleston refused to appoint a commissioner as directed by law, submitting the statement, "The act of the legislature is void, because it attempts to confer official powers upon non-official bodies." However, the state Supreme Court upheld the law; and commercial appointment of public personnel commissions is now the law and custom in the cities of West Virginia!

---

[23] *Kurth v. Grinde,* 32 Pac. (2d) 15 (Mont., 1934).

[24] *Grenan v. Rice,* 270 N. Y. S. 158, 150 Misc. 784 (1934).

[25] *Livingstone v. MacGillivray,* 36 Pac. (2d) 622 (Cal., 1934).

[26] *Davis v. State ex rel. Kennedy,* 187 N. E. 867 (Ohio St., 1934).

[27] *Bratton v. Dice,* 27 Pac. (2d) 1028 (Colo., 1933).

[28] 172 S. E. 711 (1934).

This account of 1934 developments in municipal administrative law may leave the reader a bit downcast, for certain it is that some unfortunate decisions were handed down in a few jurisdictions. However, no alarm is being sounded. The defeats that good, sound municipal administration suffered during 1934 are in no sense irreparable or widespread.

# CITY PLANNING AND ZONING

By Flavel Shurtleff

*Secretary, National Conference on City Planning, New York City*

There never was such a year as 1934 for planning studies and planning reports. In December the National Resources Board submitted to President Roosevelt, in accordance with his executive order, the "first attempt in our national history to make an inventory of our national assets and of the problems related thereto." Before the year ended forty-two states were at work on projects looking to a state plan and thirty-two of them had turned over thirty-two very considerable preliminary reports to the National Resources Board.

In addition to these specific planning undertakings, the Federal Civil Works Administration carried on several projects of great value to state and local planning work, notably the Federal Real Property Inventory, the Urban and Rural Tax Delinquency Surveys, and the Subsistence Homesteads Study. Planning studies and surveys were continued as favored projects by the Emergency Relief Administration which succeeded the Civil Works Administration. It was estimated by the National Resources Board that early in 1934 there were at least 10,000 technically trained workers engaged on state and local planning projects, and that 150,000 more white collar workers were employed on the federal surveys.

In every case state planning studies were made by boards or commissions specially appointed by the governor at the suggestion of the National Resources Board, as a recovery measure. The National Resources Board paid the fees of experienced planning consultants as directors of the project in each state. These inventories of assets and liabilities varied in value and comprehensiveness and reflected the diverse attitudes of peoples and governments. Some states are practically without records which the planner needs. A very few states have been so forehanded that reports were available on some phase of state planning.

Those studies which promise to contribute most to recovery have been stressed in state planning. Population statistics, land and water uses, transportation, and circulation routes are the basis of every state report and out of this is developing a public works program in which all projects, whether for immediate construction as measures of unemployment relief, or for the more distant future, will have only the highest economic justification.

Worn out farms will either be turned back to wild land or used for grazing, forest reserves, recreation areas, or wild life preserves; slum areas, whether rural or urban, will be cleaned out; stranded workers in industry, in the mines, or on the farm, will be given a better chance, perhaps in a New Deal homestead where they can raise some of their own food. With the passing of isolated farms will go the one-room school and the one farm road, both of which add disproportionately to the state's bill for education and road maintenance. Consolidation of government functions is an outstanding recommendation of several state planning reports.

County zoning, though still chiefly concentrated in Wisconsin, promises to be one of the most significant forces in rural development. So far, eighteen Wisconsin counties have passed zoning regulations. Nine of them established three separate zones: (1) a forestry zone, prohibiting agriculture and all uses involving year-long residence, but permitting forestry and seasonal recreation; (2) a recreational zone permitting forestry and all forms of recreation including year-long residence but prohibiting agriculture; (3) an unrestricted zone. The other nine counties have established only the forestry zone and the unrestricted zone.

It is estimated that not less than 4,000,000 areas of submarginal land will be closed to rural development in Wisconsin as a result of county zoning. No new movement has so generally won the support of Wisconsin people as this rural zoning program and its extension to other Wisconsin counties and to rural counties in other states should be rapid. No cases have reached the courts to test the validity of the county zoning law, but in 1931 the attorney-general of the state gave an extended opinion upholding its validity.[1]

The National Resources Board fully recognizes that responsibility for planning accomplishment must be largely local. Its vice-chairman, Frederic A. Delano, said at the Planning Conference in St. Louis last October, "the federal administration realizes that planning is not going to get done by mandates handed down from Washington. The federal administration can stimulate local action, can suggest or even insist upon standards of accomplishment, but it must always be the local people that carry out local plans." This view is concurred in most heartily by the state planning agencies. They realize that a part of the job of state planning is the organizing of local planning boards and the creation of a supporting public opinion. They have had little time to devote to this task in the research period of their existence but even a state plan in embryo has had considerable influence on local planning. It has put new life into dormant planning boards and roused other communities to take planning action for the first time. From a report of the National Resources Board issued in May, 1934, the local planning situation in 1933 may be thus summarized:

---

[1] Volume 20, *Attorney-General's Opinions,* Wisconsin, page 751.

> Of the 739 city planning boards reporting, not more than 60 had reasonably adequate appropriations. Of the 218 comprehensive city plans reported, 163 had been officially approved by the city planning board and 105 had been adopted by the city council. There were 85 county and regional planning organizations, very few with adequate appropriations and practically none with comprehensive plans.

This situation was greatly changed at the end of 1934. Complete statistics are not available but the number of local and county planning commissions was greatly increased. Many city and county planning studies were being carried on with the help of technical workers made available by the State Emergency Relief Administrations and much more support was given to planning by the public and by the public's official representatives. In some instances cities or counties with mutual problems banded together to establish joint planning agencies. Examples of this are the joint city planning commission established by Muskegon, Muskegon Heights, and North Muskegon, Michigan, and the interstate planning district comprised of Whitman County, Washington, and Latah County, Idaho.

In the Northwest, largely because of the activities of the Pacific-Northwest Regional Planning Commission, 200 new city and county planning boards were created in 1934. Idaho, a state which had no official planning body, either local, county, or state, before 1934, has now a most interesting and complete organization for planning. One hundred per cent of the population is represented through active county planning boards. There are seven planning districts comprising twenty-seven out of the forty-four counties in the state. These planning districts are the natural drainage basins of the state. Fifty-five villages, towns, and cities now have planning boards. This has all been done in six months' time.

Whether state planning will be just another spasm or will be continued as a permanent state function is now before the legislatures of many states. Kentucky, New Jersey, Maryland and Washington passed laws authorizing state planning agencies in 1934. Indiana is reported to be the first in 1935 to have favored such legislation. In Connecticut the only opposition at the committee hearings on the subject was offered by a senator whose point was that in a time when state agencies were being consolidated and abolished there shouldn't be any new commission created. He entirely missed the point which Governor Lehmann of New York made clear in his message to the Legislature:

> Several departments of the state government are already at work on many of these problems (taxation, sub-marginal lands, blighted rural communities, etc.) and much progress has been made, but there is no one state agency now charged with the study of all these matters in their relation to each other, and with the formulation of a comprehensive scheme for the development of the state along lines socially and economically desirable for all the people. It will be the function of the state planning board to correlate the findings of the several departments.

Planners have often been blamed for starting at the wrong end. The critics say that state planning should have come first and that the broad designs of state and of county should have been filled in later for the city. But perhaps it is as well that the trial and error period in planning has been concentrated largely in a few hundred cities and certainly this is true with regard to legislation. Planners now know better what powers and duties should be given to planning agencies of all sorts.

The courts dealt kindly with cases involving planning and zoning in 1934. Most of the decisions were concerned with provisions of zoning ordinances,[2] but billboard regulations were upheld in a most important group of Massachusetts cases.[3] These cases have been in litigation for about ten years. The decision completely upholds the validity of the regulations adopted by the state department of public works in pursuance of the so-called billboard amendment of the Massachusetts constitution.

The signs of 1934 point to more master plans for all kinds of governmental units, particularly for counties and larger regions. If these master plans are to have a greater influence on actual development and on public works programs there must be more effective administration and this means better state laws, better local ordinances, non-political planning commissions of long tenure, and much stronger public support.

---

[2] *Cf.* especially *Phillips v. Board of Appeals* (Mass.) 190 N. E. 601, holding that a showing that a property was no longer rentable at a profit under existing zoning lines, was not sufficient to warrant a modification of the zoning classification, and *Lombardo v. City of Dallas* (Tex.), 73 S. W. (2) 475 in which it was held that a comprehensive zoning ordinance does not constitute a taking of property without due process of law even when it excludes filling stations from a residential district.

[3] These cases decided on January 10, 1935, will probably be cited as *General Outdoor Advertising Company v. Department of Public Works.*

# PLAYGROUNDS AND RECREATION

By Jay B. Nash

*Professor, School of Education, New York University*

The year 1934 was marked by many important conferences on the problems of youth, leisure, and crime. National associations such as the American Physical Education Association, American Institute of Park Executives, Progressive Education Association, and many divisions of these parent groups, gave a prominent place to the problems of playgrounds and recreation.

A significant event during the year was the meeting of the twentieth National Recreation Congress in Washington, D. C., attended by approximately 1,000 delegates. The Congress afforded opportunity for discussion of many leisure problems arising out of the present emergency. An unusual feature was the participation by many outstanding representatives of the federal government who made valuable contributions to the discussions.

The year was characterized by the operation of municipal recreation programs and service with somewhat limited budgets supplemented, however, by the use of large numbers of relief workers assigned for various types of recreation service. Of special significance from the standpoint of organization and administration has been the rather widespread development of leisure time programs under emergency relief auspices. In a number of states state leisure time directors have been appointed under the relief administration and district and county supervisors have also been appointed to administer the recreation and leisure time programs throughout the state. It will be of interest to note whether the development of these leisure time programs on a county basis will, if continued over a period of years, result in the widespread establishment of county units of administration of recreation programs.

Studies of leisure time services provided by both public and private agencies have been carried on in a number of cities under various auspices. Among the cities in which such studies have been made in 1934 have been St. Louis, Cincinnati, Boston, Reading and Erie, Pennsylvania, Peoria, Illinois, Hartford, Connecticut, and the four Oranges and Maplewood, New Jersey. A survey for the purpose of studying the administration of the governmental agencies concerned with recreation and to recommend administrative changes was carried on in 1934 in Washington, D. C.

Various branches of the federal government have concerned themselves with the question of recreation. Perhaps one of the outstanding developments has been the study of land and water resources under the National Resources Board with a view to the development of large parks and reservations especially near metropolitan areas.

Unusual advances were made during the year in increasing under public auspices opportunities for outdoor recreation through the allotment of large sums of money to the National Forest Service, the National Park Service, the Biologic Survey for the purchase of submarginal farm land for forests, recreation, and wild-life conservation purposes. Of special significance was the selection by the National Park Service of lands and waters for general recreational purposes in many metropolitan regions. Great improvements were made in the recreational facilities of counties, metropolitan regions, state and federal parks and forests through the work of many CCC camps.

The need for extending recreational opportunities for young people and adults has been repeatedly emphasized during 1934. Population studies showing a gradually increasing proportion of older people in the population, the increasing amount of leisure of employed people and continued unemployment have emphasized the need for recreational opportunities for adults. A number of studies of the leisure time activities and desires of adults, notably the study conducted by the National Recreation Association and reported under the title *The Leisure Hours of 5,000 People,* contribute additional evidence of this need.

Public authorities became increasingly conscious in 1934 of the place of cultural activities in the leisure-time program and were more willing to spend public money for the encouragement of painting, music, drama, forums, and a great variety of other adult educational activities. Public encouragement of cultural activities of this type has been widely practiced for a long time in European countries but it is new in the United States. Allentown, Pennsylvania, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, and Sioux City, Iowa, led the way in the establishment of outdoor theaters and music amphitheaters in public parks, during the past year.

Not counting appropriations of $5,991,303 made by state relief administrations for work projects in the recreation field the national outlay for city and county recreation facilities was approximately one-half of that of 1929. Although whole departments were eliminated in only a few cases, it meant drastic cuts. There was some transfer of duties from one department to another. In some few scattered areas some actual advances were made.

In the field of outdoor activity, there was a marked revival during 1934 of interest and participation in winter sports. This is especially true of skiing which bids fair to become one of the outstanding national winter sports activities in those sections of the United States with favorable climatic conditions. This unusual interest in winter sports is due partly to private promotion of this type of recreation and an unusually favorable season but partly to ample public provisions for winter sports, especially skiing. The state of New Hampshire made available forty miles of new ski trails in sixteen different localities.

*Administrative improvements.* In a number of cities the possibility or desirability of changing the form of the local municipal recreation organization has been considered but no changes of importance have resulted. Marked changes have been made, however, in the internal organization of the municipal park services in New York and Chicago during the year 1934. In New York City the change consisted of consolidating the five borough park departments under a single park commissioner and placing responsibility for the city-wide park recreation service under a single recreation executive. In Chicago an approach to unification in the city's park service was reached through the consolidation of a number of special park districts into the Chicago Park District under a single board. As a result of this consolidation, responsibility for recreation in the Chicago parks has been centered in a single recreation executive.

It may be said that on the whole there has been a trend toward centralization of administrative authority. In line with this trend was the consolidation of park districts in Chicago where the outstanding features of the reorganization were: (1) the reduction in the number of separate bodies levying taxes and the unification under one park board of the responsibilities of 114 commissioners; (2) the reduction in excessive overhead cost; (3) home rule for Chicago—one of the larger park boards had previously been appointed by the governor; (4) the placing of park expenditures and finances under statutory budget control provision; (5) the limiting of future bonded debts to be incurred by the new Chicago Park District to only 1½ per cent of the tax value of property instead of 5 per cent, the former limit for each of the 22 park districts; (6) the requiring of a referendum on future park board issues; (7) unified park planning and development. The Chicago Park District commissioners have been appointed by the mayor and approved by the city council. The appointment of a general superintendent has already been made. An important step has been taken in the creation of the Chicago Public Recreation Commission consisting of about 29 members who will act in an advisory capacity to the park commissioners. (The act became effective May 1, 1934 and its validity has been upheld by the Supreme Court of Illinois.)

Special legislation was enacted in Massachusetts allowing the Metropolitan District Commission to construct bathing beaches for towns whose facilities were affected by the new water supply system.

There have been few, if any, attempts in 1934 to secure state legislation enabling government units to provide recreation facilities or service. Tax limitations, however, have exerted a marked influence on recreation, as well as on other types of municipal services, especially those which have more recently been established.

On the other hand, however, a majority of the forty-three state planning boards set up during 1934 have emphasized recreational planning as a major activity. The state of Wyoming took advantage of the federal work relief program under PWA and FERA by constructing a series of master plans for the development of a state-wide system of municipal parks, one or more of which are nearing completion in each of the twenty-three counties of the state.

Several definite trends may be noticed. Opinion seems to be forming to the effect that many adult recreational activities should be self organized, self directed, and largely self sustaining. This is getting away from the superimposed community program. The momentous amount of money put into this field from the federal reservoir creates a degree of uncertainty. Certainly some public agencies and many private ones have taken relief workers in place of former regular employees, largely because of the saving. It will be quite difficult to get these institutions back on a spending basis. The tendency to centralize authority, thus eliminating expensive and inefficient procedures, seems well established. A growing number of public school administrators and public school officials seem to be realizing the responsibility of public education in this field. They feel that by changes in the curricula and by an improvement in methods the young people may be better trained for a more constructive use of leisure.

## PUBLIC WELFARE

By Frank Bane

*Director, American Public Welfare Association, Chicago*

Major developments in the public welfare field in 1934 include a trend toward long-time provision; a tendency toward integration of emergency relief and the permanent long-time functions; and a continued increase in participation and leadership by the federal government in its co-operative ventures with the states and the local communities. In spite of these promising tendencies, however, the year has seen altogether too little growth in certain of the more established public welfare functions. In their anxiety to make provision for the hosts of the unemployed, many of the states have allowed too much of their non-relief work to lapse into inactivity.

These trends, both hopeful and discouraging, may be seen in a variety of developments: in changes in organization, in provisions, and in administration; and in proposals regarding personnel. In many instances they have had an influence over large areas. To an appreciable extent, however, they have especially affected the municipalities, and it is to these trends that definite attention is given in this review.

Organizational changes for the most part have related to temporary agencies for the administration of emergency forms of public assistance. The FERA, by its formulation of rules and regulations, its standard-setting, and the use of the grant-in-aid, has strengthened and consolidated the relief organizations of the states. New York cities were authorized to create municipal public welfare commissions. Baltimore, Maryland, by charter amendment, set up a new city department of public welfare to replace its supervisors of city charities. As to changes in provision and administration, there will be discussed in turn the developments in the care of those unemployed persons not "on relief," and the changes in the fields of public assistance, immigration, mental hygiene, child welfare, and corrections.[1]

The federal government has continued and expanded its program on behalf of the entire group of unemployed and of others in fiscal distress. The Division of Subsistence Homesteads has set up several projects, beginning with those in such centers as Reedsville, Pennsylvania; Crossville, Tennessee; and Wichita Falls, Texas. To meet the exceptionally severe problems which developed early in 1934, drought relief was greatly expanded under direct and deficiency appropriations totalling $531 million. Appropriations for the Surplus Foods Corporation provided for purchase and distribution of a large variety of products: butter, cheese, rice, potatoes, grass seed, cotton, cotton ticking, toweling, sheeting, comforter covering, cattle, calves, sheep, canned beef, fresh beef, boneless beef, and fresh veal. The Corporation also undertook to process and distribute hides for leather coats. The CCC expanded its facilities to include a larger number of young men, whose families continued to benefit by the allocation of the larger part of their wages. Public works programs of state and federal governments have grown rapidly. Various metropolitan governments have been given power to exceed their debt limitations and/or to borrow direct from the federal government for relief projects. The Reemployment Service, which developed a broad program under CWA has, since the discontinuance of CWA, reorganized on a district basis. The National Resources Board, which reported in December, proposed

[1] Recreation and housing are dealt with elsewhere in this YEAR BOOK.

development of water resources for recreation; aid in revising standards of living in certain agricultural regions; the making available of large areas of land for purposes of popular recreation; and the bringing about of better programs generally for socially useful public works. The Joint Committee on Self-help (set up by the FERA and the Department of the Interior, Division of Subsistence Homesteads, in 1933) has actively promoted the self-help co-operatives in the several states. It is estimated that there are more than 50,000 persons engaged in such programs. There are a number of clusters of these associations, especially in the West near Puget Sound, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. Those near Los Angeles have progressed farther into exchange than the others have, and have by far the greatest numerical strength, both of units and of members.

In June the President authorized the TVA to make a study and a plan for the social development of the region. Under this order the Board has spread employment; set up a training course for leisure time; supplied vocational guidance; employed an advanced form of civil service for the selection of personnel (more than 40,000 men having been examined); provided a system of health education and medical care including physical examinations for selection and assignment of jobs, and including provision for correction of defects; and begun co-operative studies. Relief to property owners, affecting thousands of the unemployed, proceeded through the RFC, which was continued as a lending body; the creation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to refinance mortgages; and state statutory provisions for such relief as postponement of mortgage foreclosures.

Public assistance refers to aid given to various groups: the unemployed who are "on relief"; destitute persons cared for under the poor laws; and recipients of the categorical forms of relief—mothers' aid, old age pensions, etc. These will be discussed in order.

Reports of the FERA show that the unemployment relief load continued to grow during the year. Between November, 1933, and November, 1934, the number of families on relief rose from $3\frac{1}{3}$ million to $4\frac{1}{5}$ million; and of persons on relief from 11½ million to 19 million. The 12 per cent of the population which had been on relief in 1933 jumped to 15 per cent in 1934. In South Dakota in 1934, 35 per cent of the population was on relief; in North Dakota, 29 per cent. Vermont, however, had only 6 per cent, while Delaware, New Hampshire, and Virginia had 7 per cent each.

Certain groups in the relief load aroused especial interest throughout 1934: the transients (first taken under the federal wing in 1933); the local homeless men; and the local homeless women.

Controversy as to policy, charges of maladministration, and a great deal of actually valuable activity characterized the work relief programs for the unemployed. Launched in 1933, the CWA program, designed to furnish work relief on a broad scale with largely local control, reached its peak in May, 1934, when four million persons, one-half of whom were from relief rolls, were employed. Wages were at the prevailing rate, with fixed maximum total earnings. Relief clients, once on the CWA rolls, became ineligible for services from the relief offices. In April, 1934, after sharp criticism of maladministration, but also after a brilliant performance on the relief side, CWA disbanded. The post-CWA work relief program is far more restricted in scope. Persons receiving work relief benefits remain on relief rolls. From informal reports it is learned that in Kansas 85 to 90 per cent of the persons on relief rolls were on work relief in late 1934. In Wisconsin, on the other hand, approximately 50 per cent are on work relief. Local and state funds are now largely relied upon for materials, supplies, and equipment.

Anticipating Congressional action on work relief, in May, 1934, the FERA undertook to study a sample of the unemployed on relief rolls of 179 cities scattered over the United States. The findings are not yet available in final form, but from two preliminary reports, based upon samples, it is learned that of nearly four million persons, between 16 and 64 years of age, who were classified as working or seeking work, 3½ million had previously had some employment outside CWA, CCC, and Work Relief projects. A study of their occupational histories showed that the hazards of unemployment had laid heavily upon certain occupational groups: domestics and those in personal service; manufacturing and mechanical industries' employees; and especially workers in the building trades, where 6 per cent of the general population contributed 13 per cent of the sample. It is estimated that one-fourth of the urban workers in the building industry are on relief.

A determination of employability is not, however, a simple calculation which may lightly be based upon such data as these. The possibility of employment depends on the state of the labor market no less than upon such factors as training, variety of skills, and applicability of skills to locally available industrial opportunities. Again, it is important to remember that certain groups recorded as "willing to work" are unlikely ever to be reabsorbed into a gradually reviving industry. Among these are the group of those forty-five years of age or over [47 per cent of the experienced persons in the sample from Boston, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, Providence, and Rochester (New York)]; those all the members of whose households are, for purposes of employment, either too old, disabled, very young, or confined at home by the care of babies, invalids, or old people (11 per cent of the sample); those now at work, but whose earnings are insufficient to meet the minimum family budget, yet who may prefer the security of employment in private industry to the uncertainties of another works program (13 per cent of the sample); and, finally, those who, although now on work relief, would be, were there adequate facilities for physical examinations, declared unfit to work.

The year has witnessed a continuation by the state courts, the legislatures, and the social work press, of the controversy as to whether one on work relief is eligible to the benefits of workmen's compensation. Early in the year Congress extended to employees of CWA and enrollees in CCC certain provisions of the federal workmen's compensation act. New Jersey, having in 1933 denied the benefits of the state act to work relief employees, in 1934 set up a special compensability. New York legislatively and expressly excluded work relief clients from the benefit of its act, but provided for a special allowance (not to exceed $3,500 in any case) in case of occupational disease or death. The courts have, meanwhile, generally held that if all the elements of normal employment are present, persons on work relief have compensable rights. Where the right was denied (as it was in most jurisdictions), the theories were, that work relief constituted casual employment;[2] that the payment was a gift, not a wage;[3] and hence that there was no contract of employment.[4] Courts denied the right in Nevada, Wisconsin, and California in 1934, although under varying circumstances the courts of Nebraska, New York, Louisiana, and Georgia had allowed it. Perhaps the most arresting decision was that in *Davenport v. City of Detroit,*[5] where the Michigan Supreme Court held that there was no compensability in the case of a shelter client who, while preparing a soap substitute containing lye, and while being paid only shelter and fifty cents a week for his labor, suffered an injury resulting in blindness.

Progress toward adequacy of relief is of course difficult to measure. It is, however, perfectly clear that there is a wide variation in average monthly benefits per family, both as between states and, within each state, as between the principal city areas and the non-city areas. In November, 1934, FERA reported $38.05 as the average for city areas, while the average for non-city areas was $22.41—a discrepancy of $15.64 per month per family. Increasing adequacy of provision is, however, reflected in New York, where the legislature, reversing an earlier stand, now expressly provides for cash benefits for home relief, and in Michigan and Rhode Island, where, by statute, relief has been extended to cover items not previously allowed. Administrative provisions have, furthermore, extended increasing liberality in state after state. Rent, medical care, clothing, and household allowances are now all included in the relief budgets of some areas.

---

[2] But see *contra, City of Waycross* v. *Hayes,* 172 S.E. 756, January 24, 1934.

[3] *Martin* v. *Industrial Accident Commission,* 76 CAD p. 36, 30 Pacific (2nd) 527. (California).

[4] In California the courts have further refined the conditions: there is no contract of employment where the claimant has received direct aid as a condition precedent to the receipt of work relief. *McBurney* v. *Industrial Accident Commission,* 200 Cal. 124. See also *Rico* v. *Industrial Accident Commission,* 76 CAD 835 (California).

[5] 256 N.W. 354, September 18, 1934.

Total monthly costs of public relief in the country as a whole have risen rapidly throughout the year. The FERA reports that in October of 1933 the total costs were \$64½ million. By October of 1934 they were \$156½ million. Local participation decreased from 22 per cent to 13 per cent. State participation decreased from 15 per cent to 9 per cent. Federal participation, of course, increased. In October, 1933, the federal treasury was supplying 62.3 per cent of all the public relief funds. By October, 1934, it was supplying 77.8 per cent. A wide variation marked the percentage contribution of metropolitan areas. A study of the 37 largest cities shows that their contribution during the first nine months of 1934 was 19 per cent of the total. The variation between cities was enormous: Memphis and Houston appear to have contributed nothing; 16 cities contributed less than 10 per cent; 32 contributed less than 33 per cent; only Boston contributed more than 50 per cent. One of the reasons for this variation is, of course, the frequent statutory obligation upon the counties, as, for example, in Arkansas, where the cities therefore had to resort to a voluntary charity tax. Pine Bluff and Little Rock added a tax of ten cents to each consumer's utility tax. Payments, received on about 20 per cent of the bills, produced approximately \$1,300 to \$2,200 a month. Relief deficits occurred in all the major Connecticut cities. They were met by a variety of means: cash balances, subsequent cash levies, funding bonds, and refunding bonds.

The change in proportions of relief costs borne, respectively, by the public and by the private agencies, cannot be authoritatively stated. A recent United States Children's Bureau study does indicate, however, that during the period from October, 1933, to October, 1934, as estimated from an urban sample of 119 cities, there was an increase of 79 per cent in the public contribution to unemployment relief funds, and a decrease of 33 per cent in private contributions to all relief funds.

During the biennium 1933-1934 only twelve states failed to make some statutory provision for financing unemployment relief. Twelve states issued bonds. Six other states relied upon special taxes and/or appropriations from the general fund.[6] Among the special taxes levied expressly for relief, the sales or occupational tax was especially frequent, being in operation in at least seven states in 1934.[7] Taxes were also laid on horse-racing, pari-mutuel betting, inheritances, income, and, more frequent than the others, motor fuel.[8] An excise tax was in operation in five states.[9] A few states permitted their local governments to levy a general property tax for relief purposes.[10]

---

[6] New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Massachusetts, Louisiana, and Illinois in 1934.

Although it is impossible to cover, in this report, much important labor legislation, it should be stated that proposals for unemployment insurance, while nowhere successful, were numerous in the legislatures which met, in special or in regular session, in 1934. Wisconsin, the one state already having such legislation, has found that the law and the regulations of the Industrial Commission did not profoundly affect the cities and villages as employers: extensive exemptions[11] protected the larger cities, while the smaller cities and villages had no subject employments having ten or more persons during the eighteen weeks prior to the calendar year 1934. Numbers of the states either provided for special legislative committees on unemployment insurance, or received reports from committees appointed during the preceding year.

Non-relief services in most of the states and localities of the country have been slowly, but none the less surely, breaking down. Hope for them was greatly stimulated, however, by the appointment in 1934 of the President's Commission on Economic Security, which, by the route of federal leadership, has had an unparalleled opportunity to develop an orderly program to promote co-ordination of the now scattered activities that relate to human welfare, to initiate and promote constructive social planning, and to devote attention to the need for social security. The effect of their report, already delivered, belongs to the story of developments during 1935.

Little has been done to revise the utterly antiquated poor laws of the states. A conference on governmental objectives for social work, held in February, 1934, under the auspices of the American Association of Social Workers, recommended many poor law changes, among them abolition of the provisions regarding settlement. The 1934 legislation, however, did not reflect the growing sentiment in this direction.

In the field of mothers' pensions, four developments may be cited. The total amount of funds available has been grossly inadequate; the numbers of communities in which grants are made has been decreasing; the average monthly grant has dwindled; and the number of eligible applicants has increased. As to the amounts available, it is true that in a sample study the U. S. Children's Bureau has found that there was a 3.9 per cent increase in the total funds expended for such assistance in 1934, as compared with the expenditures of 1933. Adequacy of funds is not to be determined, however, without regard to the numbers of applicants. Miss Grace Abbott, until recently the Chief of the United States Children's Bureau, estimates that at least 75 per cent more mothers than are now in receipt of assistance are eligible and in need. Ninety counties in 12 of the 20 states studied by the Bureau in 1934 had recently discontinued grants. There was a marked fall in the average monthly benefits per family in almost all jurisdictions. A large proportion were making grants of less than $20, no small number were granting less than $10, and in some counties of southern Illinois the average grant fell below $4. In this discouraging picture, there is some hint of better things to come in the action of the Virginia legislature when it extended the amount of its state-aid to the extent of one-half the expenditures of the local authority.

---

[7] Expressly for relief. Arizona, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Missouri, New Mexico, and Utah.

[8] Ohio, California, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, Illinois.

[9] Louisiana, Massachusetts, Montana, New Mexico, and Ohio.

[10] Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, New York, and Tennessee in 1934.

[11] School teachers, policemen, firemen, elective and appointive officials, board members, and employees hired by the month.

Minnesota has now amended her old age pension act making the grants mandatory and state-wide. With the approval of an old age pension bill in March, 1934, Iowa became the 28th state having such legislation, while between January and March of 1935 more than 350 bills on the subject have been introduced into 41 of the 43 state legislatures now in session. Arkansas's pension law has been declared unconstitutional. Colorado has replaced an earlier act, once declared unconstitutional. New Orleans is the first American city to adopt a municipal old age pension ordinance. Enacted because of the inability to secure state action for the relief of this group, the ordinance provides a substantial grant, a reasonable administrative machinery, and a wide spread of beneficiaries.

The advances in the care of the handicapped and in the field of immigration have been meagre.

The public mental hygiene program shows little progress. The hospitals for the insane remain over-crowded; construction of new buildings has virtually ceased; medical and nursing services have been substantially reduced; certain social service units have been abolished; outside clinical services were materially curtailed or entirely abolished; more mentally ill persons are, it is believed, in jails and almshouses today than there have been at any time in the past decade.

For reports in the children's field[12] it would be natural to turn to the current annual report of the chief of the U. S. Children's Bureau. It is a sorry comment on "economy campaigns" that in the economy wave of 1933 these separate reports were dropped, and only abbreviated and combined reports made available in the *21st Annual Report of the U. S.*

---

[12] Little is reported on maternal and infant hygiene developments in 1934.

*Secretary of Labor* for the fiscal year ended June, 1933. Dependent children have suffered from over-crowding of institutions, a breakdown of home-finding, and curtailment of boarding home care and clinical services. Juvenile court staffs have been reduced, in many places so materially that they have seriously crippled the social work activities of the courts. To meet the growing problems of juvenile "delinquency," the U. S. Children's Bureau, in co-operation with other public and private agencies, held two regional conferences in 1934. The conferences considered problems of juvenile court organization, probation services, detention facilities, and state and community facilities for dealing with problem children. Columbia University has completed a 1934 survey of "juvenile delinquency" in 114 neighborhoods of New York City, and a study of "delinquency" rates in Berkeley, as of the period from 1928 to 1932, has just been completed by the University of Southern California. The University of Michigan has established a juvenile delinquency service to disseminate information on the status of delinquency throughout the state.

Child labor legislation lagged during the year. The promulgation of the codes of fair competition under the NRA accomplished, temporarily, however, a mass release of child labor from industry such as years of legislation could not accomplish. The legislatures met chiefly in called sessions during this year. The child labor amendment was not up for ratification in the few legislatures which met in regular session in 1934; but it should be noted that at present writing four states have ratified in 1935. This brings the total to 24 states.

In spite of some encouraging signs, the correctional institutions remain, in general, over-crowded, and the prison populations idle. The situation in the state prisons was profoundly affected by the Hawes-Cooper law, which became effective in January, 1934. In effect the act sought to restrict interstate shipment of prison-made goods, the value of which, in 1933, is said to have reached the sizeable sum of $17 million. In this crisis the prison administrators promptly submitted, as a code under the NRA, a compact designed to eliminate certain abuses of prison labor. By June, 1934, more than 30 states had signed this pact. It has been approved by the President. A code authority has been set up, and the provisions are now in operation. The adoption of the compact "marks an epoch in the age-long effort to solve this baffling problem."

Parole and probation staffs have been cut to an extent actually dangerous to the community in most places.

Progress reports on personnel are perhaps the best available indices of progress in the field. It may be fairly stated that in many states there was, under the ERA, a distinct strengthening of the personnel in state and local relief units. Thirteen states have set up personnel bureaus for the selection of emergency workers. Many jurisdictions have devised forms of merit service for their temporary or permanent public welfare positions. Nevertheless civil service programs "have nowhere met with spectacular advances during the last year." A report of June, 1934, states that except for Wisconsin and Maryland, the 10 states subject to civil service have exempted emergency relief personnel from any civil service provision. The recommendations of the Committee of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel, reported elsewhere in this volume, especially suggests that the time has now come to terminate the exemptions of the new "emergency" agencies from the operation of the civil service laws. A survey in 33 states, also reported in June, 1934, showed a "tremendous dilution of the professional group": with only 8,000 members in the American Association of Social Workers, there were 20,000 persons engaged in social work in the public welfare (chiefly in the relief) field. There was also discernible a marked inadequacy in the total numbers of persons in social work.

The accomplishments in public welfare in 1934, relatively rich in the relief field, too meagre in the permanent field, are not to be dismissed without reference to the fact that much may confidently be expected in 1935 as a result of an increasing federal leadership and enriched state provision.

## HOUSING *

By Coleman Woodbury

*Director, National Association of Housing Officials, Chicago*

During 1934, the number of federal and local governmental housing agencies increased very rapidly. Federal agencies not only increased in number, but two of them were drastically reorganized. A score of local agencies were established and despite difficulties, most of them made some headway during the year.

*Federal Agencies.* At the beginning of 1934 the Housing Division of the Public Works Administration had begun to realize the weaknesses, under existing economic conditions, of its program of lending to private limited-dividend corporations. During the first half of the year this policy was abandoned and direct building was undertaken by the Division as an agent of the United States Government. The Public Works Emergency Housing Corporation, a Delaware corporation chartered by the PWA late in 1933 as its operating agency, became inactive because Comptroller-General McCarl refused to approve the transfer of funds to it. This refusal, however, did not stop the program of direct building. Despite a drastic reorganization of personnel, at the end of 1934 the Housing Division was supervising eight limited-dividend housing projects, had twenty-seven federal projects approved, and in the first stages of development had prepared several others for approval. These three classes of undertakings had used up practically all of the $150,000,000 allocated to the Division by the Administrator of Public Works.

---

* Developments in 1934 in this field are treated in considerable detail in the *Housing Officials Yearbook, 1935.*

Two cases on the PWA housing program were decided in federal district courts. In July the district court in Cleveland upheld the government's action in acquiring land by eminent domain for a housing site.[1] The question of the constitutionality of condemnation for housing was not clearly raised and the decision was not appealed. Late in the year the constitutionality of condemning land for slum clearance and low-cost housing was challenged before the District Court in Louisville, Kentucky. The land sought to be acquired was for a development in that city. Although the decision, which held that slum clearance and low-cost housing were not federal public uses for which eminent domain could be exercised, was not handed down until January 4, 1935, the case was one of the major events of the year.[2] The decision is being appealed and government counsel are trying to take the appeal directly to the Supreme Court to avoid delay and difficulties due to uncertainty on this vital point.

The Subsistence Homesteads Division of the Department of Interior has also re-organized during the year and its work has been centralized in the Federal Subsistence Homesteads Corporation. It had sixty projects actively under consideration at the close of the year and forty-two of them were sufficiently advanced to have been publicly announced.

During July the Federal Housing Administration was established in accordance with the National Housing Act passed by Congress the previous month. This administration has three lines of activity; (1) insuring unsecured loans for the repair and remodeling of real estate improvements, including residential buildings, (2) establishing a system of mutual mortgage insurance on residential buildings accommodating not more than four families, and (3) establishing a similar insurance plan for loans to low-cost housing developments by housing authorities or other public bodies. While the first of these three activities was developed first with only mildly encouraging results, the system of mutual mortgage insurance was fairly well formulated by the end of the year. It has the possibility of bringing some order and system into the patched up combination of ignorance, ballyhoo, and chicanery that passed for the mortgage system before 1929. The effectiveness of FHA's present policies can be determined only after much further trial.

---

[1] No. 18076, Northern District of Ohio.

[2] 9 Fed. Supp. (1934) 137.

The FERA through its Rural Rehabilitation Division working with state relief commissions undertook two types of housing work during the year. It assisted in the repair and rebuilding of farm houses. Much of this work was in the southwest. The Texas Relief Commission was the leader. The Division also encouraged and directed the development of what it calls "rural industrial communities" which are very similar to subsistence homesteads developments. Three of these communities were built and partially occupied at the end of the year. They are Wood Lake, Texas; Mississippi County, Arkansas; and Red House, West Virginia. Purchase of land for other communities by state rural rehabilitation corporations has been approved in Florida, Louisiana, Georgia, South Dakota, South Carolina, and in four other localities in Texas.

Relief agencies in many cities, following the start made in March under the CWA, approved housing surveys of various kinds and the demolition of unfit and insanitary housing as work relief projects. During recent weeks the FERA has assisted greatly in increasing the effectiveness of housing surveys by assigning experienced statisticians to consult with local housing groups undertaking these studies.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board had four major activities during 1934. Through the Home Owners' Loan Corporation it advanced more than $2,000,000,000 to distressed owners of small residential properties. The Board estimates that during the first weeks of 1935 it will have exhausted the fund of $3,000,000,000 given it by Congress to be lent through the HOLC. The Board also continued to administer its original agency, the Home Loan Bank System, which advances funds to lending institutions, mostly savings and loan associations, which are its members. Although membership in the System increased during the years 1933 and 1934 from 116 to over 3,000, the loans made by the System to its members were at a low point at the end of 1934, being considerably less than earlier in the life of the System and much less than the total lines of credit approved. This, of course, reflected the hesitancy and inability of private agencies to make loans for housing purposes under existing conditions for the income groups that they are at the present able to serve.

The Board also was supervising the incorporation and operating of federal savings and loan associations. In the last weeks of 1934 nearly 600 of these federally chartered associations were in existence, of which about 130 formerly had been state chartered building and loan associations. Finally, the Board was charged by the National Housing Act with administering a system of insurance of investments in savings and loan associations. The agency for this activity is the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to which $100,000,000 was appropriated by the Act.

As a necessary part of its program of power development, of flood control and economic rehabilitation, the Tennessee Valley Authority began to build the town of Norris about twenty miles from the site of the dam. Over three hundred family units were completed or were under construction at the end of the year. Many promising ideas in planning and construction have been tried and these efforts should contribute much to the general understanding of housing in this country.

*State and Local Organizations.* Although 1934 was a busy year for the federal housing agencies, by no means all of the activity was centered in them. At the beginning of the year Ohio was the only state with legislation authorizing the establishing of housing authorities with powers to acquire, own, and operate low-cost developments. During the year such legislation was passed in New York, Michigan, Illinois, Kentucky, South Carolina, Delaware, West Virginia, New Jersey and Maryland. Local housing authorities were the operating agencies provided for except in New Jersey and Maryland, in which state agencies were created with power to operate throughout the state. In addition Congress authorized the creation of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Authority which was designed to eliminate the alley slums that have been the focus of housing discussion in that city for the last twenty years. Local housing authorities were established in New York City, Schenectady, and Buffalo, New York; Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, Toledo, Warren, and Youngstown, Ohio; Detroit, Michigan; St. Clair County, Illinois, (East St. Louis); Lexington, Kentucky; and Columbia, South Carolina. Los Angeles and Milwaukee, convinced that they have sufficient powers to operate low-cost housing under their municipal charters, worked on plans without seeking additional state legislation. Official housing commissions without power to own and operate properties were established in San Francisco, Memphis, and Atlanta. In addition, literally dozens of other communities became at least partially awakened to the possibilities of low-cost housing. The consultants of the National Association of Housing Officials visited 47 cities during the year to assist in organizing housing work, making surveys, drafting legislation, etc.

Local agencies have also added to the development of ideas and procedures. The New York City Housing Authority, with capable technical direction, has completed some thorough housing studies upon which to base its plans. It has taken the lead in a program of demolition of unfit tenements in New York. Its agreement with Vincent Astor for neighborhood rehabilitation of an old tenement house district is one of the most interesting experiments of the year. The Schenectady Authority, looking upon housing as one part of city planning, worked out a plan for the demolition of slum areas and their future use for parking and other commercial purposes. The families now living in these areas are to be rehoused on inexpensive land in outlying parts of the city. The housing record of the board of public land commissioners of Milwaukee is notable for giving up a slum clearance project and the substitution of a lower cost development on an outlying site. These are but examples of the contributions made by the more aggressive and better equipped local housing agencies.

*Ideas and Policies.* The tour of the European housing experts, Sir Raymond Unwin, Miss A. J. Samuel, and Dr. Ernst Kahn, and their Baltimore meeting in October with over one hundred American housing officials and students, helped to clarify many ideas and to strengthen the programs and the policies of local and federal agencies. The statement developed at the Baltimore meeting and endorsed by almost all of those who attended was printed under the title *A Housing Program for the United States,* over 20,000 copies of which were distributed before the end of the year and the demand for it still continues.

The importance of public education in housing became unmistakable during 1934. In addition to the official publicity of the federal agencies the National Public Housing Conference worked valiantly through regional and national meetings and a monthly news sheet. Among local civic housing groups with strong flairs for public education were the Washington Committee on Housing, the Housing Section of the Welfare Council of New York, and the Metropolitan Housing Council of Chicago. Among official state and local agencies the New York City and the New Jersey State authorities were probably most active. The discontinuance of Millar's Housing Letter was a serious loss to all those concerned with spreading an understanding and support of housing.

The real property inventory and the financial survey of urban housing, begun originally under the direction of the Department of Commerce, created widespread interest in the possibility of providing a solid factual foundation for housing activities, both public and private. A study in Cleveland showed conclusively that slum areas do not provide sufficient revenue to take care of the costs of governmental services in them. A Boston study was completed at the end of the year comparing the ratio of expenditure and income in six different types of districts within the city.[3] The study shows on the basis of a sampling process that the cost of administering governmental services in a slum area far exceeds the revenue derived, that governmental revenue from suburban areas does not quite meet the cost of services, and that business, industrial, and high rental areas provide revenues for these sources in the rest of the city as well as in the areas themselves.

---

[3] City Planning Board, *Report on the Income and Cost of Six Districts in the City of Boston* (Boston, 1934).

As a result of these and other studies and a lively discussion of the pros and cons of housing, particularly in architectural and real estate magazines, and the practical experience of many groups recommending sites for developments, the need for looking upon housing as one problem of city rebuilding has become more generally recognized. Although many persons claim that too much time is going into studies and not enough into construction, many others are urging that methods of study and planning must be improved at the same time that construction is under way. Responsibility for actual developments is also the responsibility for avoiding the disastrous mistakes of some private investments in residential districts.

*Conclusion.* Housing activity in 1934, particularly in the preliminary work of organization and planning, has grown very rapidly. A keener understanding of problems and alternative policies is also developing. The chief problems of the future are the management of large-scale developments and the coordination of different housing agencies, both federal and local. The chief dangers seem to be that administrative practice may outrun public understanding of needs and possibilities and that a false sense of security may develop because of the temporary absence of a united and aggressive opposition to existing policies.

## PUBLIC HEALTH

By W. F. Walker, Dr. P.H.

*Director, Division of Health Studies, The Commonwealth Fund*

The year 1934 was more favorable than otherwise to public health development in the United States. Previous reduction in public appropriations for local health work was in a number of instances partially restored and there was evidence of an awakening to the real need of organized health service. Studies of the effect of the depression on the sickness rate of individuals and families who had suffered most in loss of income indicated a direct relation between the lowering of the standard of living and disease experience. This served to focus attention on health problems as sequels of economic depression. Health officers have become concerned with the problem of making medical and nursing service available to the necessitous groups as well as of extending preventive services to more effective degrees. The public recognition of health as one of the factors in economic recovery resulted in federal action which is far reaching in its effect.

The need of medical and nursing service for families on relief was met in many communities through the use of relief funds under the FERA to pay physicians for medical care in the home. Some communities used funds from the same source to employ nurses who would give nursing service to relief families in the home similar to a visiting nurse service. In some instances, though not always, both of these services were available in the same community. Experience indicated the need for better organization.

Under the Public Works Administration federal funds were made available in certain instances for health center buildings and for hospitals. Through this channel New York City is planning to build seven centers (of a total of thirty) which it is estimated are needed to effectively decentralize the work of the health department. The advantages of such decentralization through the medium of a health center have already been demonstrated in Boston and Los Angeles County. In New York each center is designed to serve a population of about 200,000 people. It will be in charge of a district health officer, especially qualified for the work and supported by the necessary medical, nursing and administrative personnel. All of the public health services in the area will focus through the center whether supported by official or voluntary funds. The need for establishing a more intimate contact between the public and the health department in large cities has long been recognized as an administrative problem of major importance. The development in New York will be watched with great interest by all cities over 500,000.

The health programs of many states and local areas were given appreciable stimulation through grants-in-aid made by the United States Public Health Service. One million dollars was allocated from relief funds to the Public Health Service to give financial aid to those states and localities which had been most severely affected by the depression. These funds were used to assist those areas where public health services were already established and had either been curtailed or had never been adequately staffed for lack of funds.

In the fall the President's cabinet committee on economic security gave consideration among other things to public health and the need for federal financing and leadership. This body concluded that there could be no development of state and local public health service in the country sufficient in scope to deal with the current health problems without the federal government's stimulating both state and local activity by providing trained leadership and aiding directly in the financing of local services on a participating basis. As a result, legislation was introduced in the 1935 session of Congress calling for an annual appropriation to the United States Public Health Service of ten million dollars. To initiate such a program of federal aid the President's committee recognized that the total need for federal assistance was probably in the vicinity of twenty million dollars but that the amount named would be all that could be effectively utilized until states and local governments had increased their facilities for local health service.

This action marks a new era in public health development in this country. It recognizes: (1) the need and the possibilities of a national program of state and local health services; (2) that public health is a factor in national security and as such demands federal action; (3) that not all states and counties are capable of supporting an adequate public health program from their own resources; (4) that both state and federal governments must take steps to equalize the burden; (5) that disease is no respecter of political boundaries; and (6) that health problems affecting the lives and the economic status of one area affect the entire body politically.

The problem of centralizing health service to the extent that a full-time administrative force can be supported has been attacked successfully in the Los Angeles metropolitan area where thirty-six cities now contract with the health department of Los Angeles County for public health services. Los Angeles County is also responsible for another interesting development in that 10,000 municipal employees in the county are provided with medical service on a centralized basis by the Ross-Loos clinic for a stated monthly fee.

The state board of health in Utah supervised during the year a state-wide typhoid inoculation campaign which resulted in the vaccination of 100,000 persons as a protection against insanitary conditions caused by drouth.

Of the developments during the year the recognition of public health activities by the federal government was the most significant. It was reported to the annual meeting of the American Public Health Association that a reduction of mortality rates since 1900 indicates that now 600,000 fewer deaths occur annually than at the turn of the century. This decrease is attributable largely to public health activities for the control of tuberculosis, pneumonia, typhoid fever, diphtheria, scarlet fever, and infant diseases with the result that expectation of life at birth has been extended eleven years since 1900 and the expectation at age twenty has increased four years. With full recognition of the value of public health services we can look forward to a more orderly administration and expansion of public health activities in states and municipalities alike.

# POLICE ADMINISTRATION

By O. W. Wilson

*Chief of Police, Wichita, Kansas*

The past year has marked the beginning of a new epoch in law enforcement. The Emergency Crime Committee of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Copeland Committee, and the activity of Attorney-General Cummings have awakened organized society to a realization of the weaknesses of the innumerable independent and unco-ordinated police agencies in this country. Federal legislation strengthening the government's crime fighting machinery and expanding the jurisdiction of the U. S. Department of Justice has made possible the greatest drive against organized crime that this country has witnessed. Public enemies have been mowed down consistently and certainly. Desperadoes who flaunted the law in the face of local enforcement officers have been speedily brought to justice.

In December the Attorney-General called a National Crime Conference which made, among many recommendations, eight of special interest:

1. A national scientific and educational center for training carefully selected personnel in the broad field of criminal law administration, and the treatment of crime and criminals.
2. State compacts to permit officers to cross state lines in pursuit of criminals and to obtain witnesses, and to establish joint police units.
3. A better form of co-ordinated control by means of a state department of justice, or otherwise.
4. Tightening of parole laws and improvement in parole administration.
5. Indeterminate sentences controlled by qualified officials who would judge whether a prisoner was fit to rejoin society or required further confinement.
6. Jury verdicts in criminal cases by less than a unanimous vote except in the case of certain major felonies.
7. Permitting court and counsel to comment on the failure of the defendant to testify in his own behalf.
8. Alibi defense law.

Growing out of a recognition of the fact that the present weaknesses of the American police system are inherent in the highly decentralized and unco-ordinated nature of our myriad independent police agencies, comes the conclusion, far reaching in its potential effect, that the final solution to our problem of lawlessness lies not in voluntary and makeshift integration, but in actual consolidation. The effectiveness of forty thousand independent public police forces as compared to a limited number of consolidated police agencies, is as a mob with no recognized leader as compared to a regiment of carefully drilled soldiers. The trend toward consolidation is unmistakable, but it will be a consolidation within the several states and not national in its scope.

The effort being made in many states to establish state police systems is another indication of the general recognition of the need for centralization. Active interest in state police legislation led Public Administration Service to prepare a model state police bill. A companion bill was also prepared for the Committee on Uniform Crime Records of the International Association of Chiefs of Police setting up a state bureau of criminal identification, investigation, and statistics.

The American Bar Association at its annual meeting recommended that state departments of justice co-ordinate law enforcement activities within each state. A proposed amendment to the California state constitution relieving the sheriffs and constables of their duties to enforce the criminal laws, placing this responsibility in the hands of the state police and providing for the consolidation of the police of contiguous cities into a single metropolitan police force, illustrates the type of reorganization under consideration to bring about necessary consolidation and centralization of police activity.

Regional co-ordination and consolidation have continued in favor and have cropped out again and again in widely separated sections of the country. Police radio has been the most powerful conciliator in this movement. Lines of communication through teletype and radio have proved powerful factors in knitting independent police agencies into regional organizations. Operating largely through voluntary co-operation, legal consolidation as the next step seems obvious, and has been taken in at least one instance. In addition to advantages of communication and control, many regional organizations have provided finger-print clearing houses and central records bureaus for clearing stolen property and information on crimes and criminals.

Action contemplated by many state legislatures providing for police pensions, or for putting existing pension plans in better shape, is an indication of the improved regard in which the public holds their police. State crime conferences in many states, following the National Crime Conference, have served to focus local attention on the crime situation and give further evidence of the popular favor accorded the cause of law enforcement.

The proper selection of personnel has been given strong impetus by the co-operation of the police with L. J. O'Rourke of the United States Civil Service Commission in the development of an adaptability test. The personnel of about 125 municipal police departments have been examined by this device. In addition to developing a test of considerable merit, this activity has resulted in educating the police to the value of superior selection methods. The test has been made available by Public Administration Service to any police department which desires to use it, and the facilities of the United States Civil Service Commission are available for grading results.

It is apparent that police training has been conducive to higher standards of police administration and to the selection of a superior type of personnel. The crime conference recommended a national school for police training; individual states are giving thought to this problem; municipalities are improving the quality of their training methods and are continuing to consolidate their work in zone schools and schools held by Leagues of Municipalities. Training schools state-wide in scope were conducted in Kansas, Ohio, Virginia, and Texas last year. Educational institutions are giving greater attention to the possibilities for service through police training. For example, Northwestern University continues to offer an annual short course for traffic officers. It is apparent that police training must soon be provided by each state, and that standards of recruitment must be raised to the point that only trained men will be acceptable to any branch of police service. Impetus to a career service for police is given by a Portland, Oregon, charter amendment which requires ten years' police experience for the chief of police as a qualification for appointment and limits entrance in the department to men between the ages of 21 and 30.

Following the precedent of the Department of Justice, many municipal departments have adopted a single finger-print system. The Battley classification is the one most generally used. Finger-printing of the general public is becoming increasingly popular, as indicated by the voluntary recording of such prints by many police departments. Telephoto, which offers unusual advantages in speeding up identification, is another device offered by science for adaptation to the police field. Finger-prints as well as photographs can be transmitted by this device.

The United States Department of Justice has adopted a Modus Operandi classification for bank bandits, kidnappers, and extortionists. Municipal departments are generally becoming familiar with the M. O. principle, although they have not generally placed the idea into practical operation.

The Department of Justice laboratory, with its facilities open to all police agencies, regardless of the nature of the crime, is filling a definite need. Individual states and municipalities in increasing numbers are providing scientific laboratories for their own needs.

The past year has witnessed a continuation of the marked tendency to motorize the patrol and to provide radio facilities. This mechanization of the police departments has permitted the elimination of many district stations and an improved centralization, with the expected increase in efficiency. It is interesting to note that police radio installations in four West Virginia cities were made possible by popular subscription. Two-way communication gives promise of almost as general an acceptance in the police field as the original police radio. Salt Lake City, Peoria, Illinois, and Piedmont, California, are among the cities to adopt two-way systems, although this method of communication has not as yet been perfected. The police radio operators have organized the Associated Police Communication Officers. They are working on the problem of inter-city communication, and give some promise of developing a network covering the entire country, which will permit immediate transmission of police information within the regulations of the Federal Communications Commission. Police radio stations are now operated by 163 cities and 34 states.

The International Association of Chiefs of Police has established an office at Washington, D. C., and now provides a monthly news letter to report the work and meetings of state and regional police chief organizations, new appointments, promotions, publications, and developments in police administration.

Traffic surveys, made possible by federal relief funds, have permitted a careful analysis of the traffic problem in many cities and some states. In addition to offering a solution to many of the more serious problems, these surveys have performed meritorious service by educating the public in both the need for action and the proper course to pursue in effecting an improvement in traffic engineering and regulation.

Freer spending, more and faster cars, more miles being driven and more liquor consumed have resulted in a sudden increase in automobile fatalities, which has brought forcibly to public attention the seriousness of the traffic situation. The police have given close attention to the problem and have used every device at their command to stem the new wave of autocides.

The idea of a traffic violator's bureau has continued to spread. Accident clinics have been created in some cities for the purpose of analyzing individual accidents in order to ascertain contributing hazards to determine traffic violations, and to diagnose accident prone drivers. Because of its influence on the accident rate, strict enforcement of traffic regulations has been emphasized by most police departments. For the same reason the compulsory inspection of motor vehicles gives evidence that this plan, initiated by Memphis, will quickly spread to most sections of the country. Berkeley has experimented by sending its traffic violators to school and requiring them to pass an examination instead of sending them to jail or imposing fines. Similar schools created in other cities for traffic violators, have proved of value and have lessened the difficulty experienced by so many during the present period of depression in paying a cash fine. Highway safety films have been used with increasing frequency for educating the public in matters of safety. The use of the mobile public address system in regulating congested pedestrian and auto traffic and in educating both children and adults in safe practices, has been widely accepted. The radio and the press have responded generously to requests for assistance. The junior traffic patrol movement has continued to spread and has now extended into rural areas.

The menace of the drunk driver has been marked by increased difficulty in obtaining convictions before a jury. The general acceptance by most states of some form of drivers' license law, with its provision for revocation on conviction for drunk driving, has further accentuated the tendency toward leniency. The police are faced with the problem of presenting more conclusive proof of the actual condition of the driver than a mere statement of their opinion. The movie camera has been used by Michigan and Utah to give visual proof of the behavior of the subject with considerable success, and gives promise of coming into general use for this and other police purposes. Forty-nine of the first fifty-two cases photographed in Utah pleaded guilty on seeing their photographs and the other three were convicted when their pictures were used as evidence. Tests of various kinds intended to reveal the true condition of the subject, have been generally accepted and science gives some promise of providing actual proof of the degree of intoxication by an analysis of the breath and urine.

The plan of providing a squad of investigators equipped to thoroughly investigate each accident has been quite generally adopted. Some departments use the facilities offered by these trained and properly equipped officers in the preliminary investigation of all felonies, thus enabling them to obtain photographs of the scene, of latent finger-prints and other bits of physical evidence before they are disturbed.

The National Conference on Street and Highway Traffic has prepared a revised model traffic ordinance. Legislation relating to automobile traffic gives evidence of a steady growth of public appreciation of uniform legislation.

Interesting developments in municipal legislation include a Seattle ordinance making parents of children playing in the street subject to arrest, and another intended to prevent "ticket fixing." This latter regulation is a definite indication of the trend of public opinion. There are politically controlled cities in which it is easier to "juggle" a felony charge than it is to get a traffic ticket "fixed," because the citizens are organized to prevent "ticket fixing" and the politicians, always keen to sense public disfavor, steer a clear course away from this danger. The next decade will witness a continued strengthening of public sentiment against the privilege of "fixing tickets."

## FIRE ADMINISTRATION

By Harold A. Stone

*Executive Secretary, Bureau of Governmental Research, New Orleans*

A new interest in fire protection seems to have come to life in 1934, and of many changes in process, six or seven are discussed in this article.

*Mutual aid.* There has been much talk about mutual aid and co-operation between communities for fire protection, but little has actually been accomplished until recent months. Four mutual aid organizations have made themselves known with from eight to sixty towns inter-connected for fire fighting.

The largest is the Egyptian Fire Fighters Association, covering the entire southern end of Illinois. East St. Louis, with eight pieces of apparatus, is the largest city in the ring, while Cairo, 150 miles to the south, has three pieces. Most of the towns have only one or two pieces of equipment. Sixty communities covering 12,000 square miles, now comprise the association which began in 1925 when seven towns joined hands.

Last year, eight villages in Westchester County, New York, adopted the "fire chief's emergency plan" for mutual aid in times of disaster. Nine communities in Kenton and Campbell counties in Kentucky have joined forces. A group of cities centering around Lowell, Massachusetts, adopted a co-operative scheme late in 1933. In each of these four mutual aid organizations a "running card" is in use. This is a schedule of order in which the apparatus of neighboring towns is called for assistance by each town in the association, and shows the order in which the apparatus of these towns is to back up or "cover-in" a town whose department is out assisting another town or engaged in a serious fire of its own.

In the Kentucky plan one city of the group acts as the clearing station for all second alarms. Through it passes all calls for assistance. Another scheme is used by the Massachusetts group in which the city in distress sends its call to a neighboring city, which then dispatches the call for aid according to the pre-arranged schedule on the running card.

These four have apparently overcome the usual legal obstacles in forming a mutual aid association. There are questions of charges for apparatus sent out of town, of indemnity for damage to equipment or injury to personnel, of the legality of sending municipal property outside the city limits, and of defense, should a taxpayer suffering fire losses bring suit against the city whose apparatus was out of town instead of being available for home fires.

In the case of the Egyptian Fire Fighters Association, no charge is made for assisting other towns belonging to the association if dues are not in arrears. The dues are only $2 a year for any department, either paid or volunteer. It is customary, however, for the town receiving aid to feed the men, and furnish gasoline and oil. Sometimes the cities assisted replace damaged hose or minor equipment.

*Wholesale removal of hazards.* Hundreds, and in one city thousands, of dilapidated buildings have been pulled down in the last twelve months, not necessarily to eliminate the fire hazard, but either to reduce tax liability or to clear slum areas for a housing project. These two disguises working for better fire conditions have done wonders in Chicago, where over 2,000 unsafe structures were razed in 1934. Four large hotels were removed in Atlantic City. Indianapolis demolished 200 buildings, while Milwaukee did away with 277 in the first five months of last year.

The Chicago case is instructive, for it shows how co-operation of many agencies will bring about the removal of fire hazards in wholesale amounts. A CWA survey of 6,000 suspected buildings disclosed that major repairs were needed in 4,000, while the remainder were beyond repair. Legal difficulties prevented immediate removal of these 2,000 buildings, since condemnation of structures could only be applied to those "ready to collapse." To overcome this obstacle the Metropolitan Housing Council was created in 1934, representing the tax-supported Illinois State Housing Board, the City Housing Authority, the City Building and Health Commissioners, CWA, and the Illinois Emergency Relief Commission. This overawing giant, through publicity, coaxing, and artful negotiations proceeded to get the owner of a dilapidated building to request the State Housing Board to have it removed. The next step was to get the owner and a wrecker to agree on the cost of pulling it down for the expense was not a public one. Union men were employed at union wages, but only long enough to earn their "relief budget."

Milwaukee has a fine record for removing ancient and hazardous structures. During the past seven years 2,643 buildings have been removed, affecting 1,424 families. The schedule of demolition was speeded up nearly three times in Milwaukee, after a survey had been made in a particularly bad area. Frame buildings numbering 804, or 30 per cent of the total were subject to condemnation. Removal orders are served by the city building inspector on owners, lien holders, mortgagees and tenants. All work is let to the lowest bidder. Fortunately the courts have upheld the action of the city.

*Organization surveys.* Except for reports by the National Board of Fire Underwriters and a few by the National Fire Protection Association, fire departments have not been surveyed with anything like the frequency of police, health, and other municipal services. During 1934, however, three reports were made indicating methods of decreasing operation costs without impairing protection. These were in Boston, Providence, and Louisville. The Boston and Providence surveys were made by the local bureaus of municipal research. In both cities an excessive number of fire stations were found, mainly because of continued use of houses which were built in the days of horse-drawn apparatus. In each city the number was in excess of the standard requirements of the National Board of Fire Underwriters. Both surveys concluded that fewer stations would afford ample protection at lower costs. It would not be surprising to find scores of cities afflicted by the same costly disease of superfluous stations, indicating that more surveys of this kind might be profitable. One is now under way in New Haven, Connecticut.

*Fire insurance rates.* Cities in Florida and Wisconsin made concerted efforts last year to lower fire insurance rates. The argument for reduction put forth in Florida was based on a lower than average fire loss ratio compared to other states, coupled with a higher than average premium rate. In Wisconsin the cities, after a survey of the factors determining the insurance classification of each city, made adjustments in their protection forces to obtain a lower rating.

In this connection a national committee[1] was appointed late in 1934 by the Governmental Research Association to investigate the fire insurance grading system used by the National Board of Fire Underwriters for classifying cities according to their fire defenses and physical conditions. Earlier in the year four suggestions were made, by the author of this article, to include four new factors in the standard schedule of the National Board, *viz.,* (1) the ability to use fire defenses, *i.e.,* a measurement of personnel; (2) fire prevention; (3) moral hazard; and (4) fire losses.[2]

[1] Robert M. Goodrich, director, Providence Governmental Research Bureau; Herman Loeffler, secretary, Boston Municipal Research Bureau; Harold A. Stone, executive secretary, Bureau of Governmental Research, New Orleans; and Clarence E. Ridley, executive director, International City Managers' Association.

[2] *Fire Insurance Classification of Cities and Fire Losses,* p. 43, Public Administration Service, Chicago.

One way to better the insurance classification of a city is to control its physical expansion by city planning and zoning regulations. This factor, called "structural conditions" in the National Board's standard schedule, is the third most important of the seven factors used. To aid cities in this regard, the National Fire Protection Association brought out, last year, an excellent pamphlet on the relation of planning and zoning to fire prevention.[3]

Denver adopted a new fire code. Among the cities adopting the standard ordinance prohibiting wooden shingles within the city limits were Ferndale, Michigan, Fort Dodge, Iowa, and Franklin, New Hampshire.

*Internal organization.* As a general rule American cities during the last stages of the depression have not filled vacancies in fire forces. To keep sufficient men for emergency conditions, more and more cities are requiring the offshift to respond to multiple alarms and to make inspections. In spite of continued pressure to reduce budgets, salvage squads were placed in service in Syracuse, New York, and Columbus, Ohio. Very few of the larger fire departments are now without a salvage corps. Private salvage companies remain in only a handful of cities.

New bureaus of prevention were established in Omaha, Nebraska; Asheville, North Carolina; Birmingham, Alabama; and arson squads were created in Brockton, Massachusetts; Toronto, Ontario; and re-established in Cleveland, Ohio.

Battalion chiefs are now rotated between districts in New York City to get each acquainted with the entire city. Formerly, a chief stayed fifteen to twenty years in one district. Since new recruits are not coming into the ranks as in former years, more and more attention is being given to training. Nearly every state has at least one annual training school. Training schools for firemen were held in thirty-nine states during 1934, and four of the remaining states will hold schools in 1935. The total number of schools was over 300 attended by approximately 25,000 firemen. The average attendance at fire schools in Indiana, Michigan, Nebraska, New York, and Virginia was 2,450 per state. The various agencies sponsoring the schools or co-operating to make them possible are state municipal leagues, associations of fire chiefs and firemen, state fire marshals, insurance inspection departments, state universities and colleges, and state and federal departments in charge of vocational education. Zone or regional schools throughout a state seem to be gaining in popularity over one or two state-wide schools. In a number of states schools for instructors are held for training the instructors.

Oklahoma City has startled the old-line fire fighters by gradually inducting college men into the ranks. It now boasts of eighty-nine, most of whom have chosen fire protection as a life profession. These men, according to Chief George F. Goff, begin their work with the fire department while attending high school or the university. A co-operative plan has been worked out which does not seriously interfere with school studies.

---

[3] *Report of the Committee on City Planning and Zoning.* National Fire Protection Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston.

It is gratifying that two cities have modernized their fire department records system: Cincinnati, Ohio, and Camden, New Jersey. Here is a vast unexplored field needing the attention of department administrators, fire insurance experts, and lawyers.

*False alarms.* Another move to reduce costs of fire departments is to stop the large number of false alarms. Louisville, Kentucky, where false alarms cost $275 apiece, gives a reward for identifying culprits. Both Denver and Cincinnati have increased the severity of fines. In the latter city, a jail sentence of three to six months is imposed in addition to the fine.

A new way to catch false alarmists is being tried in London, England. A device in the fire alarm box automatically grasps the wrist of the person turning in the alarm, holding him until the firemen arrive to release him. This has the double advantage of having some one to direct the firemen to the blaze, as well as catch a false alarmer.

In New York City, false alarms increased from 5 per cent in 1918 to 31 per cent in 1933, of all alarms. Such a tremendous increase prompted the officials to start a campaign against this nefarious practice, which was estimated to cost $700,000 annually, not including accidents.

*Labor organizations.* During 1934, firemen of seventy cities joined the International Association of Fire Fighters, which is affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. This big increase brings the number of participating cities up to 300. Undoubtedly the idea of collective bargaining under the leadership of a national organization prompted this wholesale effort to restore salaries and to pass legislation giving greater security of employment. City officials can expect greater pressure and more co-ordinated efforts during 1935 and 1936 to put the men back on 1929 salary levels.

As a counter-move, Norfolk, Virginia, successfully maintained its position in the Circuit Court to prevent its firemen from belonging to any labor union. The judge stated that the rule established by the director of public service "is not only reasonable, but salutary."

An entirely different type of organization was started by the National Fire Protection Association for volunteer firemen. About 7,000 members are reported; they are from forty-three states, seven Canadian provinces, Alaska, and South America. The sponsors hope to stop the increasing fire losses in small communities where volunteer companies predominate, whereas losses in large cities are steadily declining.

*Losses.* The national decline in fire loss is nothing short of phenomenal:

FIRE LOSSES IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA, 1926-34

| Year | United States<br>(000,000 omitted) | Canada | Per Capita Loss in U. S. Cities over 20,000 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1926 | $562 | $38 | $3.35 |
| 1927 | 473 | 32 | 2.82 |
| 1928 | 465 | 36 | 2.70 |
| 1929 | 459 | 48 | 2.72 |
| 1930 | 502 | 46 | 3.01 |
| 1931 | 452 | 47 | 2.47 |
| 1932 | 401 | 42 | 2.22 |
| 1933 | 270 | 33 | 1.51 |
| 1934 | 276* | | |

---

* Subject to slight change.

One explanation for the decline is the increased activity and effectiveness in controlling arson fires. Financial reverses during the depression brought about an epidemic of arson fires. The jump in fire losses in 1930 is said to result from this cause. Then cities got busy with arsonites, so that today the problem is far closer to a solution than ever before. The 1933 loss is the lowest since 1916. There is still a long way to go, however, particularly in eliminating overinsurance, which is a direct incentive to start fires deliberately.

Perhaps one of several reasons for the continued low fire loss is the unremitting effort of two national agencies. One of these is the National Fire Waste Council, which sponsors the annual Inter-Chamber Fire Waste Contest. Lakewood, Ohio, won the grand award in 1933 in this contest. The second agency is the National Fire Protection Association, which has expanded its staff to make fire surveys in cities and to provide consulting service.

There were no excessively large individual losses in 1934 with only thirty-four fires reported as having a loss in excess of $250,000.

# PUBLIC WORKS

## By Frank W. Herring

*Assistant Editor, "Engineering News-Record," New York City*

One of the consequences of the five-year struggle against the relentless forces of the depression has been a compromise by the American municipality with its traditional self-reliance and a growing degree of dependence upon federal and state support. The tendency has been most evident in that field of service operations commonly included in the term public works. Out of the complex of factors conspiring to bring about this result, the nation-wide desire to use "public works" as an unemployment relief measure and the decreased revenues of local government have played by far the most important rôles. There will be many, no doubt, who will deplore the present trend toward federalization of municipal operations, but under the given circumstances of widespread industrial unemployment, the necessity for confining publicly created employment to operations of a public nature, financial embarrassment of municipalities and a taxation structure for local governments that is founded principally on real-estate values, it is difficult to see how the results might have been otherwise.

The major effort of the national administration to return millions to useful work has been centered in the operations of the PWA. Although the popular imagination was impressed, and in some cases stunned, by the magnitude of the fund made available to that agency, $3,300,000,000, later increased by $400,000,000, it is necessary to point out that this sum was no larger than the volume of public construction in 1930 (even exclusive of battleships) and is small compared with the pre-depression volume of private construction of $8,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000. By the end of 1934, roughly $800,000,000 of the fund had been allotted for state, county, and municipal projects; contracts had been let or day labor work begun on projects totaling $475,000,000; there had been paid out by the PWA on such projects the sum of $167,000,000. Nevertheless the achievement of the PWA has been great in the quality of hundreds of construction jobs that dot the map—waterworks, sewers, schools, roads, streets, parks, libraries, power plants, community centers, hospitals, and the like. It is impossible to estimate what the extent of local public works construction might have been during 1934 had it not been for the PWA, but it can be noted in this connection that the estimated volume of such work was $1,810,000,000 in 1934 compared with $1,194,000,000 the year preceding.

Although PWA financing was responsible for most of the increased volume of municipal construction work, revival of the municipal bond market reached unexpected proportions and led to construction issues of some $385,000,000. Street and road construction (including the federally financed highways) was the largest item, 30 per cent of the total; flood control, irrigation, and river improvements were next, amounting to 24 per cent of all state and municipal work.

Of great significance to the municipality has been the new relationship established by the PWA between the cities and the federal government. In its rôle of investment banker the PWA scrutinized closely, indeed somewhat finically, the public improvement plans of thousands of local communities. In numerous instances it became necessary for a community to amend its laws to conform with the standards of security set up by the federal agency. Here was an entirely new type of influence over municipal affairs. Further, the engineering plans themselves were also examined closely, the whole procedure being in effect a federal supervision of local public works undertakings.

Important as was the impact of the federal influence on municipal administration in the case of the PWA, the effect of the CWA and its successor, the Emergency Relief Administration, was even deeper. When the CWA was operating, local public works departments were taken into partnership by the federal government in a gigantic—sometimes frantic—effort to create useful work as quickly as possible by undertaking a wide variety of public improvements. Regulations of the CWA provided, in general, that the projects "should fall in a field that lies between normal government expenditure on the one hand and the type of construction ordinarily carried forward by the Public Works Administration on the other." However, rigid definition was impossible and the fact that the entire cost was borne by the federal government was a strong force tending to enlarge the field of such operations. It was here that the threat of federalization appeared most clearly. The curtailment and abandonment of normal routine maintenance and replacement operations and their partial reestablishment as unemployment relief projects was a widespread municipal practice. In effect it represented a federal subsidy of regular departmental operations and put a large section of the municipal public works department on an unemployment relief basis.

On the other hand, the accomplishments of the CWA and the ERA were considerable. The more run-down sectors of community life were given a lot of assistance and many first-class new facilities were added to public assets. From the point of view of the municipal administrator, the important lesson learned was that capable supervision was the primary essential if a real value was to be created. Where such supervision was available this method of construction compared favorably in efficiency with any other method. Where it was not, waste and inefficiency were ever present.

Another aspect of the tendency of cities in their distress to seek aid from outside themselves has been in the direction of state aid. The practice of granting aid in one form or another to cities in the construction or maintenance of streets was adopted during the year by a number of states. For example, the state of West Virginia assumed responsibility for the repair and reconstruction of state highways where they pass through cities. State construction of certain city streets has been inaugurated in California. Counties in New Jersey have been given permission to improve roads within city limits, with funds provided by the state. Maintenance by the state highway department of state routes within city limits was provided for in a bill passed by the Mississippi legislature which has not yet been either signed or vetoed by the governor. Highway bonds of municipal improvement districts in Arkansas cities are now being serviced by state funds.

Service charge financing has become increasingly popular, particularly in regard to sewerage and sewage disposal. Dallas, Texas, adopted a sewer tax ordinance which calls for charges on sewer connections based on the amount of water used. The Michigan legislature passed an act authorizing cities, as well as other governmental units, to issue self-liquidating revenue bonds for sewage disposal plants. The law has already been adjudged constitutional by the state supreme court. Illinois amended its existing sewer rental law so as to meet the requirements of the PWA and passed a new combined waterworks and sewerage system revenue bond act. A court decision in Arkansas upheld the right of a municipality to levy a sewerage tax for the purpose of constructing a sewerage system.

Closely associated with service-charge financing, is a growing popularity of the "Authority" type of governmental agency. Thoroughfares and bridges are to be built and operated on the toll principle by the Allegheny County Authority at Pittsburgh, Pa., and the Triborough Bridge Authority of New York City. Housing "authorities" have been established in a number of cities, including New York, Cleveland, Cincinnati, and Atlanta. Also, during the year a New Jersey Water Authority was recommended by the New Jersey State Water Policy Commission for the purpose of providing water service for that part of the state within the New York metropolitan area.

A new type of public improvement financing for which provision was made in the federal law setting up the PWA—a lease contract between the municipality and the federal government—was adopted by at least one city. Denver has entered into such an arrangement in connection with its additional water supply. The annual lease payment is calculated to be sufficient to pay interest and amortization charges, but the improvement remains the property of the federal government.

Technological advance has continued at an undiminished rate. New materials and equipment make possible a greater and greater degree of economy in municipal service operations. For example, aluminum and aluminum alloys are now given wide acceptance as structural materials. Cement is no longer the standardized material it once was, but is now available in many different types, each having its own characteristics in regard to strength development, rapidity of set, heat production, and so on. The development of special jointing devices has widened the usefulness of timber as a structural material. Paving materials are being subjected to constant research and steady improvement.

The grinding of garbage and the disposal of it in combination with sewage has received much favorable attention during the year. This procedure was tried last year at Baltimore and gave considerable promise. During 1934 a similar experiment was conducted by St. Louis, with the result that the practice has been definitely adopted in that city to supersede disposal by hog feeding.

A court decision of significance to a number of cities operating sewage treatment plants of the activated-sludge type was the finding of the federal court of appeals upholding the decision of the trial court that the patents on this process, held in this country by Activated-Sludge, Inc., were valid and had been infringed by the city of Milwaukee.* Accordingly, negotiations have been undertaken by numerous municipalities to settle on an equitable basis the damage claims of the patent holder.

Technical developments in the field of sewage treatment continue the rapid pace of recent years. Chemical treatment methods have gained considerable acceptance as a proper solution of the sewage problem under certain conditions, and have received official approval in a number of communities. Large plants to use chemical precipitation methods are being planned by New York and by the Minneapolis-St. Paul sanitary district. The Shades Valley plant at Birmingham, Alabama, recently completed by the CWA, has been in operation for about half a year and its performance has been reported to be more than satisfactory. The development of mechanical equipment for handling large quantities of sludge and the better understanding engineers now have of the flocculation and coagulation phenomena have made possible the revival of this once discredited process.

---

**City of Milwaukee vs. Activated Sludge, Inc.*, 69 Fed. (2d) 577. On October 8, 1934, the United States Supreme Court denied review.

In addition to the cities mentioned, sewage treatment plant construction has progressed in Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Columbus, Ohio; Chicago, Illinois; and Cleveland, Ohio. All but the Cedar Rapids plant are of the activated-sludge type. In addition, Springfield, Missouri, put under contract during the year the major portion of a $1,000,000 project of flood control, sewage, and sewage treatment.

It is also interesting in this connection to note how the energy contained in sewage sludge has been put to work in increasing measure. The gas produced by digesting sludge has been used for some time as gas-engine fuel to drive compressors at activated-sludge plants. Plans for New York's new Coney Island plant now call for the utilization of this energy for sewage pumping. Chicago has decided on incineration for ultimate disposal of dewatered sludge and studies made there hold out the possibility of producing surplus heat that will be available for further energy utilization.

The problem of polluted streams has traditionally been considered one purely of local import and the remedy or relief that has been achieved has been largely on that basis. There developed during 1934, however, a shift in point of view toward a recognition of the fact that the nation as a whole has an important stake in maintaining the quality of its water resources at as high a point as is feasible. The stress laid on quality of river waters by the National Resources Board in its report published early in 1935, exemplifies this more logical way of viewing the situation. Several agencies of the federal government are now engaged in an attempt to outline means of abating the evil of stream pollution but the question of costs of waste treatment and how they shall be borne remains to bedevil the problem.

A great amount of progress was achieved during the year in modernizing and improving municipal water plants, a host of small towns availing themselves of federal financial aid for this purpose. Of great influence in bringing about the work of extension were the experiences during the summer drought which emphasized the need for larger storage facilities in many regions of the Middle West. Some cities having inadequate well supplies have added surface reservoirs, as at Springfield, Ill. and others, having small surface supplies have gone to wells as at Salt Lake City.

Among the larger cities scoring noteworthy achievements in this regard were: St. Louis, Missouri, in connection with a 13-mile pipe line from Stacy Park reservoir; Chicago, Illinois, in connection with the Chicago Avenue water tunnel and a new intake crib in Lake Michigan; Boston, Massachusetts, in connection with the Quabbin reservoir project; and Milwaukee, Wisconsin, in connection with a new 200-m.g.d. filtration plant. In point of magnitude, of course, the Colorado River Aqueduct and the Parker Dam on the Colorado River, to supply water to the metropolitan district surrounding Los Angeles overshadows all other operations in this field.

Major construction projects in the field of community transportation were confined to a few metropolitan centers. A good start has been made on the midtown vehicle tunnel in New York City and substantial progress also was made during the year on the elevated highway along the Hudson River waterfront in that city. Further, a PWA loan and grant of $23,000,000 is permitting the New York Board of Transportation to complete and put in service the remaining uncompleted sections of the Independent Subway system, except the Sixth Avenue line. In St. Louis there is under construction the Oakland Express Highway, extending 3 miles from the city limits to the business district. This is a three-lane roadway without grade crossings and when completed will connect the new Federal Highway No. 40 from the West with a municipal bridge leading to Illinois.

No important traffic control project was undertaken during the year except a progressive traffic signal system on Michigan Avenue in Chicago. However, accident-reduction campaigns have been put under way in many cities. Memphis has introduced a vehicle inspection system. Significant advances have been made toward national standardizing of traffic control needs; a uniform traffic code has been published and the preparation of a code on signs and markings is well advanced.

## MUNICIPAL UTILITIES*

By John Bauer

*Director, American Public Utilities Bureau, New York City*

Interest in public utilities, especially power, mounted high during 1934 and resulted in more distinct action or initiation than probably ever occurred in any prior year. This survey will be the merest summary and will be limited to trends and outstanding developments, under the following topics: (1) progress in regulation, (2) federal fact-finding, (3) federal construction projects, (4) public ownership developments, and (5) miscellaneous developments.

*1. Progress in regulation.* Pressure for more effective regulation mounted high, with constantly increasing criticism of the utility companies, especially power, as well as of the commissions and the systems of regulation. For the most part utility rates, especially for classes of consumers without recourse to alternative or competitive service, have remained on pre-depression levels, although they were then excessive and there has since been approximately a 25 per cent reduction in general prices and a 50 per cent decline in total purchasing power of the public. Naturally rate protests have accumulated, and the commissions have been overwhelmed with petitions and investigations. Under the standard rate procedure, progress has been slow and little has been accomplished. Efforts at short-cuts have had no considerable success, because of company opposition and also inept planning and procedure.

---

* Most of the developments discussed in this article are more extensively discussed in a series of articles in the special public utility issue of the *National Municipal Review* for November, 1934, which was edited by the writer.

The Maryland Commission made the most significant effort at simplification of procedure in a telephone rate case involving the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore. It started with an earlier valuation and brought it down to date by application of general price index numbers, using principally the wholesale prices published by the United States Bureau of Labor. Its rate reduction order of November 28, 1933, was carried to the federal court and was enjoined primarily because of disapproval of the valuation adjustment (*Public Utility Reports,* 1934, III, pp. 241 ff.). The case is now before the Supreme Court for determination.

The general index number method used by the Maryland Commission has been employed also before other commissions. It was developed particularly in two leading electric cases in New Jersey, not yet decided. The public side was presented in each instance by starting with the historical cost of plant investment as made year by year, and adjusting the amounts according to the general change in price level shown by the United States Labor Bureau wholesale price indexes. The issues raised before the commission involve, first, the general legality of valuation adjustment on the basis of price index numbers, and, second, the kind of index numbers that are properly used, whether general prices or specific costs relating to the particular kind of properties included in the investigation. Presumably these questions will receive consideration by the Supreme Court in the Maryland case. They are of prime importance to commissions striving for practical and effective methods.

*Strengthening regulation.* To expedite action provisions have been made for temporary reductions. In New York the commission was empowered to fix temporary rates on the basis of actual cost of the properties, less depreciation, provided that no less than 5 per cent be allowed on such a temporary rate base. This provision has been actively applied by the commission, but its orders up to the present have been enjoined by court action. Similar provisions have been made in Illinois and considered in other states. In South Carolina rate orders have been made retroactive upon appeal to the time of the inception of the proceeding. The New York commission has been allowed a revolving fund of $300,000 with which to make investigations on behalf of the public, and the cost in each case is to be assessed upon the company concerned. This follows the practice in Indiana and some other states, but its application in New York has been held up pending judicial determination.

*New commissions.* In Kentucky a new commission was created with usual jurisdiction over rates and other matters of public concern. Except as to railroads, public control had rested with the cities which mostly were unable to utilize the powers, so that utilities in the state were essentially unregulated. In the case of Louisville, however, the situation was different. This city had exercised control over local utilities, and in the case of telephones has an underlying franchise agreement for periodical rate revision by ordinance. This local right is still asserted by the city, but it will probably be contested if substantial rate reductions are made by local legislative action. Such a contest is imminent, for the city has had comprehensive studies made of gas, electric, and telephone rates for the purpose of thorough rate revision.

In North Carolina the commission was reorganized and granted new powers for sweeping investigation and reduction of utility rates in the state. Early in the year the new commission issued an order upon the Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company to show why the local exchange rates in the city of Raleigh should not be reduced. During the hearings that followed petitions were filed by other municipalities through the North Carolina League of Municipalities for an extension of the inquiry. As a result the commission covered the entire territory served in the state by the company, and in November ordered a general reduction of 15 per cent in exchange rates. This order has been suspended by the state court, and the company is contesting its validity.

In Louisiana the local commission in New Orleans has been deprived of its powers and its jurisdiction has been transferred to the state public service commission. This body has started a comprehensive inquiry into telephone and other utility rates for the purpose of making reductions. In Mississippi a bill to create a public service commission was defeated on the ground that it was sponsored by the utility companies and that it would check municipal action to establish public ownership.

*Limitation of federal court interference.* A serious block to effective state regulation has been removed by the enactment of the so-called Johnson Bill by Congress. Under this new law no company whose rates have been fixed by a state regulatory body will have recourse to a federal court under due process until its remedies have been exhausted in the state courts and then the matter goes directly to the Supreme Court of the United States for final review. Heretofore the common practice has been for a company unwilling to accept the rates fixed by a state commission to go directly to the federal court for an injunction and there obtain complete reinvestigation of all the aspects of valuation and cost that had been involved in the commission determination. This course succeeded extensively in blocking state action, partly because of the expense and partly because of the prevailing property-mindedness of the lower federal courts.

The solicitous attitude of the lower federal courts toward the utilities and their regard for technicality of procedure are indicated by the Maryland decision above referred to. The Supreme Court, however, especially with the shift in personnel and under the depression conditions, has shown much greater reluctance to interfere with commission action. As now constituted it will apparently interfere with commission orders only if the fact of confiscation is established beyond doubt.

This new attitude was revealed strikingly in 1933, in the Los Angeles Gas and Electric case, when the Court refused to interfere with the valuation adjustments made by the California commission, and dealt roughly with unsupported claims of "going concern" value. During 1934, in *Lindheimer vs. Illinois Bell Telephone Company,* the Court upheld an order of the Illinois commission made many years earlier, and particularly disposed of the utterly inconsistent position long maintained by the company on depreciation. In the annual operating costs the company regularly makes large depreciation allowances to take care of obsolescence as well as physical wear and deterioration, but in reduction from valuation for rate base purposes it limits the depreciation to mere physical factors as observed by inspection. The Court held that if the depreciation deduction in the rate base was proper, the annual charges to operating expenses were excessive, and so held that the company had failed to prove confiscation. Still more broadly, it held that the company cannot claim confiscation when experience shows that it was able to operate profitably under the alleged confiscatory rate schedule (*Public Utility Reports,* III, pp. 337ff.).

The Supreme Court also terminated the famous New York telephone case by denying an appeal to the company from the 1929 decision of the federal district court. This case originated before the New York commission before 1923, and happily the Supreme Court refused to consider the technicalities offered by the company for appeal.

*City action.* Logical and almost inevitable responsibility for local public utility developments rests with municipal officials. While this has been obscured by lack of direct legal provisions and by the state system of regulation, it has always been operative to greater or less extent. The important cases before the commissions and the courts have mostly been initiated by municipal authorities. The depression has greatly accentuated this municipal responsibility. The most striking instance of its effectiveness was that of Cincinnati which obtained after extensive negotiation a very favorable rate schedule with a steady diminution of rates over a period of four years until 1937.

There has been growing realization that proper rate adjustments depend upon clear policy and objectives and upon exact standards and measurements of administration. Spasmodic action is largely futile. The most striking instance of systematic rate administration has been furnished by the so-called Washington plan which received wide publicity during the latter months of 1934. This plan was developed by the District of Columbia Commission. It provides for definite valuation maintained through continuous accounting and engineering administration, for exact appeal to progressive economy and efficiency on the part of the company, and for precise measurement of successive rate reductions. From the time it went into effect in 1925 until 1934, residential rates have been reduced from 10 cents per kilowatt hour to 3.9 cents for the first 50 kilowatt hours per month (with a minimum bill of 75 cents); then 3.3 cents for the next 50 kilowatt hours; 2 cents for the next 100; and 1.5 cents beyond 200 kilowatt hours per month. During the same period the average residential consumption increased from 26 kilowatt hours per month in 1924 to about 75 kilowatt hours the past year.

These are the striking results of clear objective and systematic administration. The Washington plan distinctly points the way to effective municipal action. Any city can obtain like results if it sets out clear objectives and policy, and provides systematic day by day administration. This perspective has become increasingly embodied in the developing feeling of municipal responsibility, as indicated by action during the year on the part of Akron, Ohio; Dallas, Texas; Louisville, Kentucky; and the North Carolina League of Municipalities.

2. *Federal fact finding.* Although public utilities furnish their services mostly as local and state matters and are therefore primarily subject to state or local control, the federal government has attained an important position in practical dealing with utilities, especially power. The Federal Trade Commission has been engaged for some years in its investigation of holding companies and affiliated concerns. During 1934 it proceeded with analysis and summary of the vast volume of data which had been accumulated in previous years. Near the close of the year some of the results were formally reported to the Senate and released for general publication. Extensive financial and managerial abuses are clearly pre-

sented for consideration. The reported administration program includes congressional action to place holding companies and other interstate aspects of power production and transmission under federal control.

During the year the Federal Power Commission has conducted a countrywide survey of electric rates, in charge of W. E. Mosher as director. It will bring together on a comparable basis the rates and charges for the various classes of service in all communities throughout the country. This will make available for the first time complete rate information for the guidance of public officials charged with responsibility to consumers. A preliminary volume on residential rates has already been published.

In addition to the electric rate survey, the Federal Power Commission has been conducting an investigation into electric distribution costs. It is assembling and analyzing the available data from the various commissions, companies and municipalities to determine the variation and reasonableness of distribution costs in the different parts of the country. It has also been making a survey of national power resources available for public use.

Besides the distribution cost study by the Federal Power Commission, the New York State Power Authority made a report to the President of the United States, the governor of New York, and the chairman of the Federal Power Commission on the cost of distributing electricity. This covers generally the northeastern section of the country, and makes available for the first time extensive comparisons of distribution costs for different communities. As a broad average it shows that the total cost of producing electricity for ordinary residential use comes to about one cent per kilowatt hour, that the total cost of distribution for 50 kilowatt hours per month averages 2.5 cents per kilowatt hour, and that the total cost of supplying electricity for such a customer amounts to 3.5 cents per kilowatt hour. This is the most definite yardstick ever furnished by a public body. It indicates readily to any municipality whether its rates are out of line with present costs, and whether a local survey and positive action for reduction are warranted.

During the year the Federal Communications Commission was created with jurisdiction over interstate facilities and operations of telegraph, telephone, and radio utilities. It has been effecting its organization and bringing together basic data relating to the wire companies. Near the close of the year, it issued an order for a comprehensive investigation of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company and its affiliates to determine the intercorporate relationships, the various activities, costs, and rates. An appropriation of $750,000 has been provided for the inquiry, and the work has been started.

*3. Federal construction projects.* Active work has continued on the large federal projects for the development of hydroelectric power and its transmission and distribution. The Tennessee Valley Authority is the agency which has received major public attention and which is likely to affect most extensively the power policies of the various states and communities. It has proceeded actively with its construction program, including not only dams and power plants, but also transmission lines and the purchase of distribution properties. It has been allotted a total of $50,000,000 for its undertakings. It is exerting a tremendous stimulus for municipal ownership in the adjacent states, and for rate reductions and positive power programs in all parts of the country.

Early in 1934 the TVA entered into a contract with the Alabama Power Company for the purchase of its transmission lines in northern Alabama, extending from Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals to communities which had agreed to buy their own distribution systems. The company and the municipalities, however, failed to agree on the purchase price, and the TVA negotiated an option for the purchase of the distribution system in northern Alabama, intending that the municipalities would subsequently take over the properties. The completion of this transaction has been delayed by injunction procedure instituted by a group of preferred stockholders. In the latter part of the year the TVA urged the communities to construct their own plants to obviate legal obstruction. The city of Decatur is reported as the first to take such action.

Besides the TVA project the Public Works Administration reported in August that it had allotted an aggregate of $192,518,900 for construction and improvements of publicly owned generating plants. Of this amount, $146,250,000 was allocated to five federal projects: the Bonneville and Grand Coulee plants on the Columbia River; the Fort Peck dam on the Missouri River in Montana; the Casper-Alcova project in Wyoming; and additional funds for Boulder dam on the Colorado River.[1]

The Boulder dam construction has proceeded rapidly, and at this writing the waters of the Colorado River are being accumulated in a huge lake for flood control, the generation of electricity, irrigation, and the supply of water for general use over a wide territory, including particularly the water district in the Los Angeles section.

*4. Municipal ownership developments.* The TVA and PWA have exerted countrywide influence upon extension of municipal ownership of electric plants. In the TVA territory the city of Memphis voted overwhelmingly (16 to 1) $9,000,000 for the purchase of a municipal distribution system. The cities of Knoxville and Chattanooga have also moved toward the acquisition of electric distribution systems. Numerous smaller municipalities have either undertaken or are actively considering the institution of publicly owned systems.

---

[1] For a brief survey of the federal hydroelectric projects see the writer's, "What the Depression Has Done to Public Utilities," *Public Management*, XVI, 295-99 (October, 1934).

Public ownership has also advanced in other sections of the country. In New York the legislature enabled all municipalities to institute public ownership through local self-determination. While there had been about fifty municipal electric plants, these had been established through local charter or special legislative provisions. The new legislation, for the first time, enables any municipality to decide upon municipal ownership with freedom to proceed through purchase, negotiation, condemnation, or construction of new facilities.

The Public Service Commission of Wisconsin established a precedent by granting a certificate of convenience and necessity to the village of Hustisford to construct a municipal electric utility in competition with a private plant. This case has not yet reached the courts.

In Mississippi the rights of municipalities to finance and establish municipal plants have been enlarged. In South Carolina the rights have been clarified and strengthened; furthermore, the state has created a public service authority for the purpose of developing the Santee-Cooper hydroelectric project; no funds have been provided, but $35,000,000 is sought from the PWA.

The PWA has made fund allotments available for construction of municipal plants. This policy has been to allow 30 per cent of the cost of labor and materials in outright grants, and to extend loans for the rest of the cost, provided that the projects are self-liquidating. According to the August report, an aggregate of over $46,000,000 had been allowed to such municipal projects. In some instances, notably Camden, New Jersey, the project has been delayed by company opposition and restrictive state laws on municipal financing.

In the state of Washington municipal plants have been authorized to extend their properties and services to adjacent territory. Acting on this enlarged power the city of Seattle has started negotiation to purchase the properties of the Puget Sound Power and Light Company and to extend its operation into the territory conveniently reached by its transmission lines. The action of Seattle in levying a 3 per cent gross income tax on the private company competing with the municipally owned electric utility was upheld by the United States Supreme Court as not denying the equal protection of the laws.[2] Spokane and Bellingham have adopted similar ordinances. There is a distinct tendency elsewhere to enlarge the scope of municipal operation so as to include adjacent territory which can be economically served.

[2] *Puget Sound Power and Light Company v. City of Seattle*, 291 U. S. 619.

Much attention has been centered upon the signal success of the municipal electric plants throughout the country. According to the United States Census the commercial systems owned and operated by municipalities amounted to 1,802, but they are mostly small municipalities. Numerous instances have been reported of tax free cities where all the municipal expenses have been borne by the profits from the power plant. The correctness of these claims has been widely disputed by representatives of the private companies.

The general success of the municipal plants has been clearly established by a survey and detailed analysis of all the commercial plants in cities of 50,000 population and over. These plants are more nearly comparable in size and conditions of service to the private systems. They have not only furnished electricity at materially lower rates for general use, especially residential, but have contributed substantially otherwise to community welfare. Practically in all instances the charges for street lighting and other municipal departments are much lower than in cities served by private companies. Substantial contributions are also made to the general funds of the cities, together with provisions for the amortization of investment or retirement of bonds, or extension of properties out of earnings.

Public ownership discussion has centered particularly in power, and public management has unquestionably been successful. It furnishes not only the yardstick for rates and financial policies on the part of private companies, but indicates distinctly the line of power and other public utility organization for the future. Apart from electricity, however, there has been striking progress also in water developments, especially on the Pacific coast. In San Francisco, the Hetch-Hetchy project has been put in operation, and it furnishes practically an inexhaustible water supply for the city. In Los Angeles and the adjacent district the public project of bringing water from the Boulder dam has proceeded rapidly. Water systems constitute by far the most important municipally owned and operated utility. They supply approximately 90 per cent of the total water system service, and they furnish by far the best test of the efficiency and general effectiveness of public ownership and operation.[3]

5. *Miscellaneous developments.* The Illinois Supreme Court held in December that all utilities, both privately and publicly owned, were exempt from the state retailers' occupation tax. It was decided that utilities render "services" and do not sell "at retail tangible personal property." The Washington state 3 per cent occupation tax, however, was made

---

[3] A pamphlet on the New York City system, by far the largest in the country, is being prepared for the Public Ownership League of America, by Maurice P. Davidson, commissioner, Department of Water Supply, Gas, and Electricity of New York City.

applicable to the gross income of both water and light utilities, thereby reducing the income of municipalities owning utilities which had been contributing substantial amounts to the general fund.

In California the operative property of public utilities, which has been exempt from municipal taxation for over twenty years will be returned to local tax rolls in 1935. This will increase assessed valuations about 12 per cent on the average and in a few localities, such as San Bernardino, the assessed valuation of both city and county will be doubled.

The Florida Supreme Court held that municipal utilities are not subject to a writ of mandamus to compel the payment from utility revenues of past-due general obligation bonds for which utility earnings were not specifically pledged as security.

## SCHOOLS AND EDUCATION

By J. B. Edmonson

*Dean, School of Education, University of Michigan*

The year 1934 has been characterized by changes and unsettled conditions in the schools of the United States. The situation has been summarized by a committee of the National Education Association (*Education in the National Recovery*) and among the findings is the report that schools in 144 districts remained closed during the autumn of 1934 until the Emergency Relief Administration provided funds to open them. More than 5,000 schools are expected to close by March 1, 1935, with not more than six-months terms, unless emergency Federal aid is provided. This situation may be traced to the breakdown of local systems of taxation. The money spent on schools in 1934-35 is estimated as $475,000,000 less than the expenditure for 1929-30, and $332,000,000 less than for 1931-32, the third depression year. During the past year approximately $200,000,000 of Federal funds were expended for financial support of education. This money literally prevented the collapse of thousands of schools and colleges.

In spite of the decrease in school revenues there are 200,000 more pupils to be taught this year than last year and 1,200,000 more than in 1930. There are a few more teachers than last year, but 11,000 fewer than in 1930. The salary situation for teachers has not been favorable this year as about 250,000 teachers, nearly one in three, were receiving less than $750 annually and approximately 54,000 teachers, one in sixteen, were receiving less than $450 annually. Unpaid salaries, outstanding salary warrants, and certificates of indebtedness amounted to over $100,000,000. Owing to the pressure of financial retrenchment kindergartens, music, art, playgrounds, evening classes, classes for handicapped children, and other essential services have been eliminated from many school programs.

That the public schools face serious problems because of the breakdown in the taxation system and the demand for retrenchment in public expenditures is apparent from the situation presented in the foregoing statements. In addition there are such problems as finding a substitute for the overworked property tax which has been depended upon as the sole means of support in many states, and the problem of adjusting the income of the schools to the required tax limit laws such as Ohio's ten mill limit act. There is also the problem of deciding the proper balance between state and local communities in the matter of financial support of schools, as well as the problem of adjusting growing expenditures due to increased enrollments to a decreased income due to tax delinquencies, tax reductions, and general retrenchment. Until these financial problems are solved, the schools will continue to face difficulties in matters of support.

Various developments took place in 1934 in state-local relations regarding school finance. New York State restored a 10 per cent cut in subsidies to local school systems, but the inefficient one-room school system continues to exact heavy tribute from the state treasury. In New Jersey state bonds in the amount of $7,000,000 were voted in 1933 and loaned to cities in 1934 to pay teachers' salaries. In Louisiana a state budget committee, composed of the governor, state superintendent of public education, and state treasurer, was given full power over all local school budgets, including the appointment of teachers. Virginia enacted legislation requiring a minimum of eight months for public grade schools and provided state aid on the basis of average daily attendance and the density of population. In Illinois, the state legislature passed legislation enabling the Chicago board of education to pledge certain property to the Federal government in return for a $40,000,000 loan, which was to be used in payment of teachers' salaries.

The Research Division of the National Education Association, in a recent study of school building needs of the nation (*The Nation's School Building Needs*) reveals that thousands of school districts lack sufficient resources for current operating expenses and therefore can do little to provide needed housing facilities. Additional building facilities for 2,700,000 pupils are required merely to replace condemned and temporary structures and to provide full-time accommodations for all pupils. Likewise, about 16,000 consolidated schools ought to be established in the interest of some 5,000,000 rural children now attending poorly equipped, inefficient schools.

Among the new enterprises is the educational program conducted in the Civilian Conservation Corps camps. These camps were first set up in

1933 and are operated by the United States Army. The present educational plan provides that the United States Office of Education shall select and appoint the teaching personnel and shall serve the War Department in an advisory capacity on educational policies and procedures. All who are concerned realize that effective rehabilitation of men in camps demands not only that they be fed and clothed and given work to do, but also that they be given the opportunity to learn about the world in which they live and their relation to it. It is believed by many that these camps may lead to the development of new educational agencies that are less formal than the existing schools.

This past year has seen a marked degree of interest in the introduction of more effective programs for education for citizenship. To encourage more intelligent participation in government is the object of the Civics Research Institute, a non-partisan organization recently established with headquarters in Washington, D. C. The Institute will conduct a number of research studies in civics instruction and cooperate with the schools in an endeavor to stimulate the pupil's interest in government. It is recognized that the schools alone are not able to give pupils the sort of contact with civic affairs that will enable them to grasp the significance of the relation between the community and their own lives.

In Washington, D. C., Nebraska, Michigan, and many other places, the school authorities are working on programs of character education with special reference to the development of more effective preparation for citizenship. The new statement of the objectives of public education in Michigan devotes four of the nine goals to certain aspects of civic training. These read as follows:

(1) To cultivate a deep regard for democracy and an intelligent appreciation of democratic institutions.

(2) To develop those qualities of character which are of special significance in a democracy.

(3) To develop the willingness and the ability to cooperate effectively in a democratic society.

(4) To develop the ability to use the most effective and reliable methods in searching for truth as a basis for the discovery and solution of problems.

In many state and national conferences held during the past year there has been a large degree of emphasis on the objectives defined in the foregoing goals.

The final volume of the National Survey of Secondary Education was made available during the latter part of 1934. In this volume are presented some of the findings of the Survey as reported in the other twenty-seven monographs. Among the interesting findings is the report that the proportion of the population of high school age represented by the enrollment in public high schools in 1930 had reached 46.6 per cent. Since 1930 it is estimated that this percentage has increased to more than 60 per cent. It is also stated that by 1931 the number of junior colleges of all types was rapidly approaching 500 with the total enrollment mounting toward 100,000. The number of public secondary schools for negroes in the states providing separate schools for the two races has increased with astonishing rapidity during the past fifteen to twenty years. Continuation schools and classes and evening high schools are further means of democratization of education at the secondary level. The trend in the policies of higher institutions has been to increase the number of ways by which students may gain admission. This trend has promoted more effective articulation between the secondary schools and the colleges. The efforts to provide opportunities for public secondary education in this country have resulted in a great complexity of district and other arrangements not only for the country as a whole but within most states. This development has increased the need for an improved organization set-up in many states.

The recent development or widespread interest in community, state, and national planning has created a very genuine demand for educational planning in many states. This demand has been intensified by the numerous perplexing problems that the schools have faced because of the economic upset. The further fact that educators have discovered a deplorable lack of public understanding concerning the aims, scope, and problems of public education has also contributed to this demand for more effective educational planning. The idea of educational planning is not new, as a study of completed surveys of local, state, and national problems will reveal. The recent emphasis on long-time planning is, however, very significant.

A study of existing organizations for state educational planning reveals no one typical pattern. In some states planning commissions have been set up which represent both educators and laymen; in others the professional leadership of the state has developed a long-time program for education, either by setting up a separate planning agency or by formulating a program to be sponsored by existing educational agencies. Some planning commissions have been set up on a continuing basis, others to carry out a specific assignment, with no provision for long-time service.

The Michigan Educational Planning Commission may be cited as an illustration of these state planning agencies. This Commission consists of a cross section of the interest groups of the state and is therefore truly representative of public sentiment; it is made up largely of laymen whose attitudes are those of the general citizenry of the state. It is representative of the leadership of such influential organizations as: the State Federation of Labor, the State Manufacturers' Association, the State Real Estate Association, the Board of Commerce, the Farm Bureau, the Grange, and the Federation of Women's Clubs. Other participating organizations include the Association of University Women, the State Congress of Parents and Teachers, the Michigan Education Association, the State Federation of Teachers' Clubs and the Michigan Council on Education. Prominent educators, in the minority, supply technical information and advice. It is believed that the educational systems of many states will be aided by the work of state educational planning commissions.

## PUBLIC LIBRARIES

By Carl H. Milam

*Secretary, American Library Association, Chicago*

The number of books borrowed from libraries in 1934 was smaller than in 1933, though still much larger than in 1929. In many libraries there was a decrease in the circulation of fiction and an increase in the use of non-fiction. Reasons given for the decrease in total circulation include: decrease in the available stock of books and especially the lack of new books; increase in employment; lack of carfare and fear of incurring fines; lack of sustained reading interest among some of the new borrowers of the last few years; more money for commercial entertainment and recreation; continuation of shorter hours and small staffs.

Librarians believe, and available figures bear them out, that the seriousness of readers, which has characterized library use during the depression, continued during 1934. Many librarians find the social sciences at the top in non-fiction demand. Others note the surprisingly large use of books on the fine arts, vocations, technical subjects, business, and "self-help"—from psychology and near-psychology to how to make a living with chickens and rabbits. In fiction circulation the historical novel appears to be growing in popularity. But in fiction reading generally, opinion is about equally divided on the question of whether there is or is not any improvement in taste. Reading and reference rooms are reported as still crowded, some say busier than ever.

Appropriations remained near the bottom levels of 1933. Some went still lower. Tax limitation laws in certain states have played havoc with the legal machinery which was intended to protect the library as a relatively defenseless educational and cultural agency. But on the whole, library reports appear to show that the bottom was actually reached in 1933 and that in 1934 library appropriations made a slight start on the necessary upward climb. In two large cities, tax levying authorities, in recognition of the libraries' greatly increased work, and in one case as the result of city-wide public demands, have granted to the libraries the maximum levy allowed under the law. Out of only a few hundred for which reports are available, some 30 or 40 cities and counties report increases ranging from a few hundred to several thousand dollars and from 5 to 100 per cent.

Salaries in 67 libraries were up from the recent lows, according to reports so far received at A.L.A. headquarters. Thirty-three more promised restoration of cuts in whole or in part in 1935. The same cities, to a large extent, report slightly larger funds for books and some return toward longer hours of opening.

However, it is clear that libraries are less well equipped with books and staff to render the service their communities want and need than they were four or five years ago. Demands have greatly increased. Books have worn out without being replaced, and the staffs are smaller, actually or in relation to work done. Libraries are doing, say, 30 to 40 per cent more work with less—or at best with no more—money than in 1929 and 1930. They have been able to absorb only a fraction of the increased load through the introduction of new time and money saving procedures.

The year 1934 marked a considerable development of state and local citizen interest in libraries. The National League of Women Voters added libraries to its list of study topics. The American Legion Auxiliary made library development its major community activity. California, Maine, Missouri, New Hampshire, and Vermont organized state citizens' library committees, and the North Carolina Citizens' Committee began new activities. State conferences for library advancement were held in South Dakota and South Carolina.

Many work relief projects were sponsored by libraries and much useful extra work was done. The projects ranged from cleaning books and repairing furniture to the compiling of important bibliographies and participation in community adult education programs. Approximately $1,250,000 of PWA funds has been spent in the erection of public library buildings in seventeen states. Minor construction enterprises have also been carried out in several cities and towns with CWA assistance. Library service to a few new areas developed in spite of economic conditions, some in the normal way and a great many others with the aid of relief workers.

A research project of major importance is under way at the University of Chicago Graduate Library School. It is concerned with the public administration of public library service. One of the results is a manuscript on "The Library and Government" by Carleton B. Joeckel, now in the hands of the printer. A companion study by Arnold Miles got well under way in 1934 and may be completed in 1935. Two other studies of considerable importance to public librarians were begun in 1934 by the same institution: a survey of the library facilities and needs in the Chicago metropolitan area, and a survey of the Rosenwald demonstration county libraries in the southern states. State surveys of public library facilities, under various auspices, were made or begun in Colorado, Illinois, and Kentucky.

Perhaps the outstanding library event of 1934 was the inauguration in January of a national library planning movement. In addition to the national committee, there were planning committees in forty-two states and the District of Columbia at the end of the year. National and state committees have solicited the aid of official planning boards and public administrators. Factual statements about library facilities with maps and graphs are beginning to appear in the reports of the official planning boards. In a few states, legislation based on new plans was prepared in 1934 for introduction in the 1935 legislative sessions.

While there is wide variation from state to state, the general trend may be indicated by the following summary of the national plan:

Federation and co-ordination of public libraries in large systems, each system to serve a metropolitan area, a large county or several counties;

Assumption of responsibility by the state for public library service to all the people in the state;

State appropriations to supplement local library funds or to provide a minimum library program;

A federal library agency to provide nation-wide leadership in the library movement;

Federal aid to equalize library facilities in the several states, so administered as to encourage state and local initiative and control;

Certification of librarians under state law;

Co-ordination of all library resources and services in the interest of adult education, scholarship, and research.

# JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION

By Herbert Harley

*Secretary-Treasurer, American Judicature Society*

Two dominant movements affecting local courts were brought to the threshold of experience in 1934. Both are based on years of dissatisfaction which has resulted in concerted action only in the last two or three years. One is reform in judicial selection; the other is the supplanting of fee-paid untrained justices of the peace. California has taken the lead in judicial selection reform, having amended the constitution to permit any county, upon referendum, to adopt a new plan for superior court judges. Vacancies are to be filled by executive appointment with the consent of a special board composed of the attorney general, the chief justice of the supreme court, and the presiding justice of the appellate court of the district. At the end of each term judges' names will be placed on the ballot, but without competition, and the voters will pass upon their retention for another term. It is expected that Los Angeles County will adopt this system; fifty short term superior court judges under non-partisan voting have been much bedevilled by politics. The system applies immediately to judges of the three appellate courts and the supreme court.

At the present time resolutions looking to constitutional amendments intended to get judges out of politics are pending in Washington, Utah, Kansas, Michigan, and Ohio. In Florida, Wisconsin, and Georgia similar movements are under way. Various forms of appointment are proposed, the most common proposal being to limit the governor to a small list of eligibles submitted by the bar or by special commissions—in Michigan with terms of moderate length; in Ohio for good behavior; in Utah for lengthened terms. State bar associations generally take the lead in this movement, although in California credit went largely to the Chamber of Commerce and the Commonwealth Club. A national movement to free the bench from political influence is under way, but at this stage it does not extend to inferior tribunals.

Virginia has taken the lead in supplanting fee-paid justices with competent, salaried, and judicially directed justices. After trying a new system for two years it was extended to all the counties in 1934, having worked well. It is substantially the plan approved by the Ohio State Bar Association and now before the legislature. The idea is to make the judge who serves the county responsible for all minor jurisdiction. He is empowered to appoint a justice, to serve at his pleasure, to take care of this work under his immediate supervision. In the most populous Ohio county, Cuyahoga, an additional common pleas judge will be required; in a number of other counties the appointed official will be called a commissioner. In this state justices and constables have often converted the court into a racket.

Studies of justices courts have been made in Connecticut, Michigan, Kansas, Cook County (Illinois), and other states and the general lack of usefulness of justices of the peace is everywhere revealed. In Los Angeles a redistricting recommended by the Bureau of Efficiency has eliminated many justices and a saving of $100,000 in taxes is estimated.[1]

The Washington State Bar is trying to secure amendment of the constitution to substitute for justices of the peace a system which gives justices jurisdiction up to $500, to provide that only lawyers shall serve, and to fix the number for each county according to population. It contemplates holding court at times away from the county seat. While such justices are to be elected there is provision for their removal by a board of three superior court judges for cause.[2]

In Louisiana an amendment extends judges' terms from four to six years, so that they will be chosen at general, instead of local, elections. By statute the governor of Louisiana will appoint the jury commissioners for Orleans Parish.

The foregoing steps to get judges out of politics and to provide competent judges for local tribunals promise great results, but it must be said, nevertheless, that the national campaign against crime has not yet considered reform of the police and justice courts. It is concerned at this time mainly with better policing and detecting and with changes in courtroom procedure. The bar associations are more forward in respect to getting better judges and prosecutors. The American Bar Association has recommended the creation of departments of justice in every state, and California takes the lead in this by an amendment adopted last November. The attorney general now becomes the superintendent and assistant of all the local prosecutors. One of the reforms most needed is non-political selection of prosecutors and the development of career men with no other professional duties or interests.

The matter of crooked lawyers comes to the front through the integration of the lawyers in fifteen states, with statutory powers to enforce rules of conduct. Bills to create similar all-inclusive, statutory state bars are pending in fourteen other states at this time. The creation of responsible, self-governing state bars (subject to the Supreme Court's powers) is fundamental to all legal reforms. This movement establishes for the first time in our history a genuine bar. Such a bar immediately enforces bar discipline and promotes the improvement of procedure in both civil and criminal fields.

---

[1] See *Tax Digest* (March, 1934), pp. 82ff.

[2] See *The State Bar Review,* Seattle, (Jan. 1935), for both constitutional amendment and enabling act.

In a large city court there is a great saving in expense by "pooling" the jurors, as has been done in the Chicago municipal court for nearly thirty years. The former practice was to summon about twenty-eight jurors for each trial judge and allow half of them to be idle most of the time. The new system has been adopted in New York with a saving of more than $350,000 a year and in Los Angeles with a saving of $100,000 since July, 1933.[3] It is being considered for use in Massachusetts. This is but one rather insignificant improvement which is possible in courts having administrative direction. There can be no responsible and economical administration of justice until all the courts of a state, from supreme to police court, are recognized as parts of a unified judicial system and given responsible administration and recording. The principle is being accepted but constitutional limitations and judicial and bar conservatism make progress slow.

In a number of cities, notably Chicago, Cleveland, Minneapolis, Boston, Detroit, Milwaukee, St. Paul, Los Angeles, Buffalo, Atlanta, and Des Moines, there are local courts of varied jurisdiction which have chief justices with more or less adequate power to direct the work of all judges and officials. Even with political judges there has been great progress under this system. Running courts is a business which calls for definite authority and at least moderate talent. Keeping full records and publishing reports is essential. There are few scandals in such courts, and usually little delay for litigants. The municipal and district courts of Milwaukee have published an excellent annual report.

Two of the best courts in the country are the unified criminal court in Detroit and the circuit court of Wayne County, sitting in Detroit. Even with short terms and politics the judges of these courts, having definite obligations to the public, have made numerous worthy innovations in practice. At this time there are over three hundred candidates for nomination to thirty judgeships in these courts, which gives emphasis to the merit of the proposal to amend the Michigan constitution and cut out the "popular" choosing of judges on ballots.

---

[3] See *Tax Digest* (March, 1934), pp. 79, 99ff.

# COUNTY GOVERNMENT

By Paul W. Wager

*Associate Professor of Rural Social Economics, University of North Carolina*

The year 1934 registered some encouraging gains in the field of county government as well as some disheartening repulses. Perhaps the laurels should go to Ohio for the greatest progress. Following the adoption in November, 1933, of the constitutional amendment which released Ohio counties from their legislative strait-jackets four counties have elected charter commissions. These are Cuyahoga (Cleveland), Lucas (Toledo), Mahoning (Youngstown), and Hamilton (Cincinnati). The commissions have authority to submit to vote of the people proposals for consolidating city and county, for abolishing numerous elective offices, and for thoroughly reorganizing the structure of local government within the county. The Cuyahoga County Commission has already declared itself in favor of the county manager form of government.

In addition to the charter procedure, the Ohio amendment authorizes the enactment by the legislature of optional plans of county government. A special commission appointed by the Governor to draft this enabling legislation has recommended three options—the county manager plan proper, a modified county manager plan similar to Virginia's executive form, and a plan embodying the principles of the mayor-council plan of government.

Some headway in the removal of constitutional obstructions was also made in New York State. A constitutional amendment was passed by a special session of the legislature which when reenacted by a subsequent legislature and confirmed by popular vote will make it possible for any county in the state to depart from the present uniform pattern of county organization. Along with the amendment the legislature passed an act which allows any county outside New York City to draft and adopt a charter for its own government. A charter commission may be created upon the initiative either of the board of supervisors or 15 per cent of the voters. The act provides that if the charter affects only the structure of county government it may be adopted by a simple majority of the voters of the county, but if it transfers to the county any functions now possessed by cities, towns, or other local units it must obtain the approval of a majority of the voters in each municipality containing 25 per cent or more of the population and also a majority outside these municipalities. This act is significant in that the legislature relinquishes to the local units authority which it has heretofore jealously withheld. There is a question, however, whether this act is itself constitutional in that it was enacted prior to the ratification of the amendment. All efforts of the New York City Charter Commission to abolish the five counties within the boundaries of New York City, if and when a new charter is adopted, were defeated.

An auspicious start in the direction of home rule for Texas counties came to a disconcerting halt. The adoption in 1933 of an amendment to the constitution permitting home rule to counties with as much as 62,000 population led to the election of charter commissions in no less than six of the more populous counties, but in only one, El Paso, was a charter submitted. The amendment requires that a charter to be ratified must receive a majority vote both in the incorporated cities and in the rural districts. Although more votes were cast in favor of the charter than against it in the county as a whole there was not a majority for it in the rural districts. Defeat of the home rule effort in El Paso County seemed to weaken interest in the other counties and the movement has subsided. Three other amendments to the Texas constitution relating to county reorganization were defeated in the November election, largely it is believed, because of the unpopularity of other measures on the ballot.

Likewise, Michigan's valiant effort to amend its constitution in the interest of county home rule was checked at the November election. Unable to get the amendment endorsed by the legislature, its proponents had to resort to initiative petition to get it on the ballot. The necessary signatures were secured and the amendment was submitted, but an indiscriminating electorate rejected it along with other less commendable legislation. The amendment would have permitted the elimination of existing county constitutional offices and the adoption of a more simplified government either by optional law or county home rule. A second constitutional initiative petition for 1936 is the hope of the State Committee on County Reorganization.

Not everywhere, however, were efforts to lift constitutional barriers unsuccessful. In Florida the voters approved an amendment to the state constitution which will permit the drafting of a charter for a consolidated city and county government in Duval County, containing Jacksonville. Missouri voters approved an amendment to their constitution which will permit a reorganization of St. Louis. In Montana an amendment was approved which permits county boards to consolidate certain county offices. In South Carolina two constitutional amendments were ratified which permit the abolition of the fee system and the placing of county officers on a salary basis. Virginia actually abolished the fee system of compensating county officers by act of its assembly.

*Toward a stronger executive.* The year also witnessed further progress in the direction of a stronger county executive. The validity of the act under which one Virginia county (Henrico) adopted the county manager form of government and another county (Albemarle) adopted the executive form was upheld by the State Supreme Court.[1] The first Virginia county to adopt the manager plan (Arlington) did so under a local act. Since the passage of the general enabling act in 1933, six counties have held elections, four involving the executive form and two the manager form. The only election in 1934 was in Roanoke County where the executive form was rejected.

Taking advantage of the enabling legislation enacted by the Nebraska legislature in 1933, Douglas County (Omaha) adopted the manager form of government in 1934 by a vote of 43,568 to 30,980. The enabling legislation follows closely the model county manager law drafted by a committee of the National Municipal League in 1930. The new form of government will go into effect in January, 1937. Widespread interest in the manager plan is being shown in other counties in the state.

In California, San Mateo and Sacramento counties completed their first year of operation under their new charters with gratifying results, though there are still too many elective officers in both charters. An attempt to adopt a charter providing for a managerial form of government in Santa Clara county was defeated in February.

A bill providing a county manager enabling act for all counties in New Jersey was introduced in the legislature but failed to pass.

Petitions were circulated in Gallatin County, Montana, to place the question of the adoption of the county manager plan on the ballot in June, but an insufficient number of signatures was obtained.

Three urban counties in New York state are striving to secure a stronger executive. Early in the year the Westchester County Board of Supervisors appointed a commission of seven to prepare plans for a new form of government for that county. In February, the Survey Commission of Erie County submitted a proposed charter under which a county manager would be elected. In December the Charter Commission of Monroe County submitted to the board of supervisors a charter which provided for a county executive appointed by the supervisors for a two-year term. The county executive would appoint the commissioners of finance, public welfare, public health, public works, and the county attorney.

The Wisconsin Supreme Court recently declared unconstitutional the statute under which several counties of the state adopted the commission form of county government as a substitute for the township-supervisor system with its extremely large county boards. The Wisconsin Taxpayers Alliance points out that although the commission form might have been a slight improvement over the township-supervisor form, the proponents of county reorganization can now concentrate on securing a constitutional amendment which will permit more significant structural changes. County home rule and the county manager form of government are under consideration.

---

[1] For a discussion of these cases see article on "Administrative Law" this Year Book, p. 45.

*County consolidation.* Despite widespread agitation for county consolidation only one significant development can be recorded for the year—a step toward the consolidation of the city and county of Milwaukee. Citizens of Milwaukee county voted overwhelmingly at the November election for consolidating the city and county of Milwaukee. The referendum was purely advisory and the consolidation may be carried out in either of two ways—the merging of all municipal governments and the county government into a single central government or the merging of selected activities and functions of the various governments. Advocates of the plan believe that adoption of the first mentioned procedure would result in a saving of over a million dollars a year. The Pennsylvania legislature passed a constitutional amendment which will facilitate consolidation of Pittsburgh with Allegheny County. One of the amendments defeated in Texas would have permitted county consolidation in that state. The sentiment for consolidation is strong in California, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, and several other states.

These few examples of definite achievement can hardly be considered a full reflection of the progress in county government. The numerous taxpayers' associations which have come into existence in these depression years have, in many instances, discovered that real economy does not lie in indiscriminate curtailment of public services but in the adoption of improved methods of administration. They have discovered that the economy measures which the officeholders recommended were offered in self protection. This discovery on the part of citizens and taxpayers probably constitutes as great a step forward as more tangible achievements, for it has created the state of mind which will support fundamental reform as soon as the plans are fully developed. Improved accounting, budgetary control, and state supervisory agencies are the instrumentalities which will supply the ammunition with which the citizens can attack political strongholds. These internal improvements which make local government more transparent together with enabling legislation are paving the way for accelerated headway later on.

# COUNCIL-MANAGER GOVERNMENT*

By Lyman S. Moore

*Assistant Director of Training, The International City Managers' Association*

PROPOSALS to adopt the council-manager form of government were voted on by twenty-two cities and three counties in 1934. Six cities and one county adopted the plan. Douglas County, Nebraska (232,892) will be the largest county in the United States to have a county manager when the plan goes into effect in 1937. Two of the cities to adopt the plan were outside of the United States: Mount Royal, Quebec (3,153) becomes the fourteenth council-manager city in Canada while Limerick, Ireland (39,000) is the fourth Irish city to operate under the plan. Dublin and Dun Laoghaire had previously adopted the plan in 1930, and Cork in 1929. Four American cities to ratify council-manager charters were Schenectady, New York (95,692); Toledo, Ohio (290,718); Clifton, New Jersey (46,875); and Washington Court House, Ohio (8,426). All four cities changed from the mayor-council plan.

Sixteen cities and two counties defeated proposals to adopt council-manager government in 1934, as compared with fourteen cities and three counties in 1933, seven cities and two counties in 1932, fourteen cities in 1931, thirteen in 1930, and twenty-four in 1929. Tacoma, Washington (106,817) was the only city over 100,000 population to defeat such a proposal. The two counties were Santa Clara, California (145,118) and Hanover, Virginia (17,009). In Sioux Falls, South Dakota (33,362) successful opposition to the new charter centered around the defects of the enabling statute which is vague as to the powers of the city manager. The other cities were Chicopee, Massachusetts (43,930); Hillside, New Jersey (17,601); Houlton, Maine (6,865); Lawrence, Kansas (13,726); Little Rock, Arkansas (81,679); Marshfield, Wisconsin (8,778); Montclair, New Jersey (42,017); Morristown, New Jersey (15,197); Mount Vernon, New York (61,499); New Ulm, Minnesota (7,308); Norfolk, Nebraska (10,717); Norwalk, Connecticut (36,019); Sidney, Ohio (9,301), and Texarkana, Texas (16,602).

*Cities voting on abandoning the plan.* Of the twelve council-manager cities in which referenda were held during the year on abandoning the plan, two attempts succeeded. Fall River, Massachusetts (115,274) voted to change from Plan D (council-manager) under the Massachusetts optional charter law to Plan A (strong-mayor) by a vote of 13,864 to 10,150. St. Albans, Vermont (8,020) also abandoned the plan. Ten cities voted to retain the plan. Kenosha, Wisconsin (50,262) on November 8 at its fifth referendum on this issue since the adoption of the plan in 1921, decided again to retain the council-manager form by a vote of 8,794 to 8,602. Other cities which decided at the polls to keep the plan were Flint, Michigan (156,492) by a 3 to 1 vote; Stockton, California (47,963) by a 2 to 1 vote; Dubuque, Iowa (41,679) by a vote of 8,895 to 5,986; Burbank, California (16,662); Sweetwater, Texas (10,848); Two Rivers, Wisconsin (10,083) by a vote of 2,071 to 1,236; Cushing, Oklahoma (9,301); Saranac Lake, New York (8,020); and Camden, Maine (3,606). Pittsburg, California (9,610) which adopted the plan by ordinance in 1919, abandoned the plan by a 3 to 2 vote of the council.

---

* For data on the city manager profession and list of council-manager cities see "The City Manager Profession and Directory" page 229 this Year Book.

By way of comparison with previous years, proposals to abandon council-manager government were voted on in fifteen cities in 1933, fourteen in 1932, thirteen in 1931, and nine in 1930. Two cities abandoned the plan in 1933, two in 1932, two in 1931, and one in 1930.

Twenty-one cities have abandoned the plan by vote of the people in the last twenty-six years. In addition to Fall River, Massachusetts, and St. Albans, Vermont, these cities are: Fort Myers, St. Cloud, and Tampa, Florida; Santa Barbara, California; Waltham, and Orange, Massachusetts; Albion, Michigan; Akron, Cleveland, and Lima, Ohio; Collinsville, Lawton, and Sulphur, Oklahoma; Brattleboro, Ludlow, and Windsor (village), Vermont; Hot Springs, Arkansas; Denton, Texas; and Brandon, Manitoba.

The center of interest in the council-manager plan during 1934 seems to have been New Jersey. Clifton adopted the plan while Hillside, Montclair, and Morristown defeated proposals to adopt it, the latter two by very close margins. A Newark taxpayers' organization secured thirteen thousand signers to a petition calling for an election on the plan on April 3, but the city corporation counsel ruled that the 15 per cent required for such a petition must have actually voted at the previous election and ruled the petition out on that score. The city clerk retained a handwriting expert who contended that the first twenty signatures were written by the same hand. As a result no election was held. A similar result obtained in Irvington when the town clerk ruled that a petition containing 1,653 signatures was not legally filed until the signers had been approved as qualified voters.

An interesting recall election was held in Long Beach, California on July 10 when all nine councilmen and the city attorney were swept out of office. The new council which was elected a month later pledged itself to support the spirit of the council-manager charter.

*Changes in Directory.* In addition to the cities which voted to adopt or to abandon the plan in 1934, one city was added and two cities were dropped from the directory of approved council-manager cities. It was discovered that Dexter, Maine (4,063) is operating under council-manager government adopted by ordinance in 1931. Orange, Massachusetts (5,365) abandoned in 1933 its council-manager charter adopted in 1929. Tulia, Texas (2,202) which adopted the plan by ordinance in 1918 has not appointed a manager since 1928 and was dropped for that reason.

### TABLE I

### GROWTH OF COUNCIL-MANAGER PLAN, 1908-1934

| Year in Effect | Adopted by Charter | Adopted by Ordinance | Total | Accumulated Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1908 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1912 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1913 | 7 | 1 | 8 | 12 |
| 1914 | 14 | 5 | 19 | 31 |
| 1915 | 17 | 4 | 21 | 52 |
| 1916 | 12 | 2 | 14 | 66 |
| 1917 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 81 |
| 1918 | 18 | 5 | 23 | 104 |
| 1919 | 24 | 2 | 26 | 130 |
| 1920 | 22 | 10 | 32 | 162 |
| 1921 | 43 | 4 | 47 | 209 |
| 1922 | 24 | 4 | 28 | 237 |
| 1923 | 26 | 3 | 29 | 266 |
| 1924 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 278 |
| 1925 | 19 | 4 | 23 | 301 |
| 1926 | 14 | 4 | 18 | 319 |
| 1927 | 18 | 5 | 23 | 342 |
| 1928 | 11 | 5 | 16 | 358 |
| 1929 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 374 |
| 1930 | 15 | 3 | 18 | 392 |
| 1931 | 14 | 4 | 18 | 410 |
| 1932 | 16 | 2 | 18 | 428 |
| 1933 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 437 |
| 1934 | 14* | 0 | 14 | 451 |
|  | 382 | 69 | 451 |  |

*Baileyville, Ellsworth, and South Portland, Maine, and Henrico County, Virginia, adopted the plan in 1933; Paducah, Kentucky, and Elmira, New York, adopted the plan in 1932; Ashland, Kentucky, adopted the plan in 1931; but the plan did not go into effect in these seven municipalities until 1934. The plan will not go into effect in Toledo, Ohio, and Schenectady, New York, until 1936, and in Douglas County, Nebraska, until 1937.

*Growth of the Plan.* The council-manager form of government, first adopted by Staunton, Virginia, in 1908, at the end of 1934 was in effect in 451 cities and counties, a complete list of which is found in the directory of the International City Managers' Association (page 232 this YEAR BOOK). Of this number, 425 cities and seven counties are in the United States, fourteen cities in Canada, four in Ireland, and one in Puerto Rico. At the end of 1919 there were 130 council-manager cities; by 1924, 278 cities; and by 1929, 374 cities were operating under the manager plan.

Thirty-six states, four Canadian provinces, Ireland, and Puerto Rico have council-manager cities. Michigan now has 43, Texas 38, Florida 37, Virginia 36, California 35, and Oklahoma 29 manager cities and counties.

Nearly one in every five cities of over 10,000 population in the United States is now operating under council-manager government. Of the ninety-three cities with over 100,000 inhabitants, seventeen or 18.3 per cent are council-manager cities. In the population group of 50,000 to 100,000 the ratio is slightly more than one in four. The classification of cities by population groups in Table 2 indicates that council-manager cities constitute a relatively large proportion of cities in the groups above 10,000 population, and a much smaller proportion of the small cities under 10,000.

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE OF COUNCIL-MANAGER CITIES TO TOTAL CITIES IN UNITED STATES

| Population Group | Total No. of Cities in Group | Cities with Council-Manager Plan Number | Per Cent |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1,000 to 2,500 | 3,086 | 48 | 1.6 |
| 2,500 to 10,000 | 2,183 | 181 | 8.3 |
| 10,000 to 25,000 | 606 | 107 | 17.7 |
| 25,000 to 50,000 | 185 | 38 | 20.5 |
| 50,000 to 100,000 | 98 | 27 | 27.6 |
| Over 100,000 | 93 | 17 | 18.3 |
| All Cities Over 1,000 | 6,251 | 418* | 6.7 |

*This total does not include seven American counties, fourteen Canadian cities, four Irish cities, one Puerto Rican city, and seven American cities with less than 1,000 population which appear in the directory.

A study of the statutory and constitutional provisions of all states reveals that of the 6,251 cities in the United States with 1,000 or more inhabitants, according to the 1930 federal census, 4,005 or 64 per cent, may adopt the council-manager form of government without securing special charters from the state legislature—*i.e.* either under constitutional home rule provisions, by adopting provisions of an optional charter law, or by adopting the plan by ordinance under permissive legislation. Cities that can adopt the manager plan in this way are found in thirty-eight states; in some states only cities within certain population limits may adopt the provisions of the state enabling act, in others practically all cities may draft and adopt their own charters under home rule, and in a few states the cities have a choice between drafting their own charters and adopting the provisions of a state enabling act. There are only ten states which have neither statutory nor constitutional provisions under which cities may adopt the council-manager plan without first securing specific legislative consent: Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Maine, Mississippi, Rhode Island, and West Virginia. However, certain cities in Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maine, and West Virginia have been able to secure special council-manager charters from their respective legislatures. The states in which certain cities, under varying limitations, can adopt the manager plan but none have done so, are: Alabama, Louisiana, Maryland, Nevada, New Hampshire, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. If the other cities (36 per cent of all cities over 1,000 population) desire to adopt council-manager government they must either secure permission from the legislature or make the plan effective by ordinance, pending the passage of enabling legislation or home rule.

### TABLE 3

### PERCENTAGE OF COUNCIL-MANAGER CITIES TO TOTAL CITIES IN UNITED STATES THAT CAN ADOPT MANAGER CHARTERS WITHOUT LEGISLATIVE ACTION

| Population Groups | No. Cities in Group | Cities That Can Adopt Plan Without Legislative Action |  | Cities With Manager Charters |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | Number[1] | Per Cent of All Cities | Number[2] | Per Cent of Cities That Can Adopt |
| 1,000 to 2,500 | 3,086 | 1733 | 56.2 | 32 | 1.8 |
| 2,500 to 10,000 | 2,183 | 1585 | 72.6 | 132 | 8.3 |
| 10,000 to 25,000 | 606 | 434 | 71.6 | 84 | 19.4 |
| 25,000 to 50,000 | 185 | 123 | 66.5 | 32 | 26.0 |
| 50,000 to 100,000 | 98 | 63 | 64.3 | 26 | 41.3 |
| Over 100,000 | 93 | 67 | 72.0 | 16 | 23.9 |
| All Cities over 1,000 | 6,251 | 4005 | 64.1 | 322 | 8.0 |

[1] This column includes all California cities over 1,000 population, although home rule charters in this state must be ratified by the legislature. The latter action is generally perfunctory.

[2] This column does not include ninety-six American cities which have secured the manager plan either by special charter or ordinance, nineteen council-manager cities in Canada, Ireland, and Puerto Rico, seven council-manager cities under 1,000 population, and seven counties now operating under the council-manager plan.

Tables 2 and 3 indicate that the council-manager plan has appealed in greater proportion to cities in the larger population groups. State legislatures have given cities under 2,500 less freedom in adopting council-manager charters and of the cities over 25,000 which are free to adopt manager charters on their own initiative almost 30 per cent have done so; almost one out of four cities over 10,000 that can adopt the plan in this way are council-manager cities.

*Legislation.* The Massachusetts General Court enacted a town manager charter for Braintree, defeated at a referendum on March 4, 1935. The Illinois legislature considered a proposal to provide an optional form of council-manager government for all cities in the state except Chicago but the bill failed to come out of committee. A county-manager bill was before the New Jersey legislature but was killed. A Kentucky bill to enable all third-class cities to adopt the council-manager plan died in committee.[1]

---

[1] For court decisions on the city manager and the council-manager plan see Marshall E. Dimock, "Administrative Law," page 45 this YEAR BOOK.

# PART TWO

# GOVERNMENTAL UNITS

Local Government Units
Metropolitan Districts
Legal Classification of Cities by States
Directory of Cities and Governmental Data
State Leagues of Municipalities

# Local Government Units*

By William Anderson

*Professor of Political Science, University of Minnesota*

AMERICANS are usually appalled when they learn about the large number of units and organizations through which local administration is carried on in this country. The number is, indeed, an astounding one, as the accompanying table reveals. This is, however, a large country, divided into forty-eight states or commonwealths, and with vast and variegated problems of local rule. Merely to state that the number of local units is large is not to condemn the system. The only sound basis for criticizing any tool or instrument is its relative effectiveness in performing the work which it is designed to do.

What is the purpose of a system of local government? In the long run most men would probably agree that it exists to provide in an effective and economical manner a number of local public services deemed to be essential or desirable in a given time and place. Upon what points can there then be differences of opinion? Upon the following, among others: (1) What services should be performed? (2) What shall be the standard of service toward which local units should work? (3) What is effective and economical service with respect to that standard and how can such service be obtained? (4) How much is it desirable to pay or sacrifice for such service? Each of these questions may be discussed in order.

(1) In every state in the union we learn from observation the people desire and have provided through local government: (a) a system of public roads, rural and urban; (b) free public education; (c) courts and law enforcement; (d) public relief activities; (e) protection to public health; (f) miscellaneous services such as recording of deeds, and births and deaths, surveying of lands, inquests into deaths, etc. These services are rendered in all parts of the states. In addition, urban places provide a very extensive list of additional services, such as sewage and garbage disposal, parks and recreation, public lighting, and many others. Rural districts also have some special services such as agricultural fairs, county farm agents, irrigation, and weed destruction.

(2) The standard of service maintained varies considerably in different places. Where people are poor and where the laws place the entire burden of support for local services wholly on the local taxpayers, the

---

* This article is based on the writer's more detailed study, *The Units of Government in the United States* (38pp.) published in 1934 by Public Administration Service, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago.

standard of public education, for example, will usually be very low. The schoolhouse will be poor, the term short, the teacher poorly paid and poorly trained. At the same time the fundamental desire for good educational facilities may be strong, though not necessarily so, and there are always agencies which try to raise the standard in such a field. State aid and federal aid may work also for higher standards, and enlargement of the taxing unit may help. In short, as a result of many factors, the American public generally has come to demand free education from the kindergarten through senior high school, for eight or nine months a year, in good buildings, and with well trained staffs of teachers. In road service, relief work, and several other cases, the upward trend of standards is equally clear, but the same is not so certain in rural police work, for example. There are, also, always some elements in the community who oppose raising the standards of public services, because they fear the expense, or the competition or interference with their own activities.

(3) On the question as to what is effective and economical service and how it can be obtained, there are still more differences of opinion. Many persons have observed how county officials criticize the state highway departments and also the township road officials for inefficiency and wastefulness; and how township road officials similarly criticize both the county and state highway departments. There is much of this sort of thing also in school administration and other fields. In short, points of view vary greatly, and so do the ideas as to how good service can be had. One says you need to have trained, educated, full-time employees in charge of all work, and both training and experience in the subordinate posts as well. Another asserts that you get better service, or more for your money, if you take the willing local worker of good common sense. This is noticeable in public works, such as road maintenance, and also in policing, county clerical services, property assessment, and other work. Where the latter view prevails numerous small governmental units, such as townships, petty villages, and small counties are deemed to be most desirable for providing local services. Another says that larger units are needed, because only they can with economy employ the best trained help and the most modern equipment and methods.

(4) Even if a somewhat better grade of service could be had from larger units, a fact which is not everywhere admitted, the needed sacrifice is one which many local units will not make unless compelled to do so. The reasoning here usually departs from the tests of efficiency and economy and enters new fields. Local self-government in small communities is held out as a boon of great value, not lightly to be sacrificed. The township is the true school of democracy and self-government, the place where men learn how to perform the tasks of government and fit

## TABLE I: NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT UNITS BY TYPES AND STATES

| State | Census Revised TOTAL | Anderson Revised TOTAL | Counties | Incorp. Places | Towns and Townships | School Districts | Other Units |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | 364 | 475 | 67 | 296 | — | 112 | — |
| Arizona | 548 | 574 | 14 | 34 | — | 457 | 69 |
| Arkansas | 4,237 | 4,491 | 75 | 389 | — | 3,193 | 834 |
| California | 5,309 | 4,277 | 57 | 278 | — | 3,677 | 265 |
| Colorado | 2,413 | 2,429 | 62 | 241 | — | 2,033 | 93 |
| Connecticut | 355 | 355 | 8 | 40 | 154 | 42 | 111 |
| Delaware[1] | 90 | 268 | 3 | 52 | — | 213 | — |
| Dist. of Columbia | 1 | 1 | — | 1 | — | — | — |
| Florida | 1,496 | 1,456 | 67 | 289 | — | 882 | 218 |
| Georgia | 2,244 | 754 | 161 | 593 | — | — | — |
| Idaho | 1,882 | 1,679 | 44 | 150 | — | 1,363 | 122 |
| Illinois | 16,341 | 17,336 | 102 | 1,128 | 1,481 | 12,186 | 2,439 |
| Indiana[2] | 2,840 | 1,830 | 92 | 523 | 1,016 | 194 | 5 |
| Iowa | 11,421 | 7,497 | 99 | 917 | 1,602 | 4,879 | — |
| Kansas | 11,093 | 11,072 | 105 | 580 | 1,550 | 8,772 | 65 |
| Kentucky | 927 | 898 | 120 | 369 | — | 395 | 14 |
| Louisiana | 1,354 | 501 | 64 | 210 | — | 66 | 161 |
| Maine | 571 | 562 | 16 | 48 | 498 | — | — |
| Maryland | 194 | 161 | 23 | 137 | — | — | 1 |
| Massachusetts | 421 | 431 | 13 | 39 | 316 | — | 63 |
| Michigan | 8,892 | 8,905 | 83 | 472 | 1,268 | 7,069 | 13 |
| Minnesota | 10,548 | 10,544 | 87 | 728 | 1,973 | 7,755 | 1 |
| Mississippi | 6,264 | 6,639 | 82 | 313 | — | 5,536 | 708 |
| Missouri | 11,208 | 11,626 | 114 | 773 | 345 | 9,211 | 1,183 |
| Montana | 2,511 | 2,667 | 56 | 116 | — | 2,437 | 58 |
| Nebraska | 8,606 | 8,455 | 93 | 529 | 506 | 7,224 | 103 |
| Nevada | 399 | 364 | 17 | 16 | — | 312 | 19 |
| New Hampshire | 245 | 489 | 10 | 11 | 224 | 244 | — |
| New Jersey | 1,134 | 1,149 | 21 | 329 | 236 | 546 | 17 |
| New Mexico | 1,182 | 195 | 31 | 56 | — | 94 | 14 |
| New York | 10,667 | 11,184 | 57 | 595 | 932 | 9,504 | 96 |
| North Carolina | 2,295 | 2,008 | 100 | 386 | — | 1,383 | 139 |
| North Dakota | 4,074 | 4,080 | 53 | 333 | 1,470 | 2,187 | 37 |
| Ohio | 4,311 | 4,487 | 88 | 862 | 1,337 | 2,095 | 105 |
| Oklahoma | 6,352 | 6,430 | 77 | 512 | 969 | 4,869 | 3 |
| Oregon | 3,113 | 2,500 | 36 | 204 | — | 2,129 | 131 |
| Pennsylvania | 5,611 | 5,583 | 66 | 985 | 1,574 | 2,585 | 373 |
| Rhode Island | 71 | 93 | — | 7 | 32 | — | 54 |
| South Carolina | 2,132 | 2,116 | 46 | 265 | — | 1,795 | 10 |
| South Dakota | 5,065 | 4,981 | 64 | 299 | 1,177 | 3,440 | 1 |
| Tennessee | 473 | 536 | 95 | 233 | — | — | 208 |
| Texas | 8,742 | 8,676 | 254 | 580 | — | 7,571 | 271 |
| Utah | 246 | 267 | 29 | 143 | — | 40 | 55 |
| Vermont | 375 | 626 | 14 | 75 | 240 | 272 | 25 |
| Virginia | 305 | 317 | 100 | 215 | — | — | 2 |
| Washington | 2,981 | 2,423 | 39 | 221 | 73 | 1,739 | 351 |
| West Virginia[3] | 654 | 673 | 55 | 208 | — | 410 | — |
| Wisconsin | 9,354 | 9,762 | 71 | 502 | 1,289 | 7,790 | 110 |
| Wyoming | 528 | 547 | 23 | 84 | — | 407 | 33 |
| TOTALS | 182,439 | 175,369 | 3,053 | 16,366 | 20,262 | 127,108 | 8,580 |

---

[1] The school districts actually operating seem to be only 15—the state and 14 others.

[2] The 1,016 townships in Indiana are both "civil" and "school" townships. Since each is governed by a single trustee controlling both classes of functions, each is counted as but one unit.

[3] Since this table was compiled, the number of school units in West Virginia has been greatly reduced by the introduction of the county-unit system.

themselves for state and national service. The small community is held out to be the natural unit for the local social life, where men meet face to face and develop their sense of citizenly responsibility; hence it should be the political and administrative unit as well. To give up these things would be to pay too high a price for any possible gain in the efficiency and economy of services.

Despite the apparent cogency of some of these arguments for retaining townships, petty villages, common school districts, and other small special districts, study and experience have led most practical administrators of wide vision to advocate larger administrative units for essential services. President Roosevelt, as governor of New York, made a most sane and liberal plea for larger units, but so have many other leaders of public thought. The general trend of their argument is about as follows:

1. In the century since President Jackson, the people have greatly increased their demands upon local government. They now generally want first class roads and schools and a number of other expensive services, and are coming to demand even more.

2. The administrative tests of efficiency and economy must now be applied to local units, and this from the point of view of what is expected of them. Sentimental and traditional objections to changing local units that are inefficient and that stand as obstacles to improved service must be overcome. An educated people, with widened horizons, who drive thirty miles quicker and with less thought about it than their forefathers drove five, have nothing to gain or to learn from keeping township control over roads or petty school district administration of schools.

3. Enlarged units of administration make possible many improvements, such as:

(a) A broader tax base for the support of local services, and a more equalized tax burden.

(b) Decreased need for state aid, and more real control of local services locally; since state aid to small and weak local units leads in the long run to state control.

(c) A larger-scale planning of public services, with more internal flexibility, so that even the rural school area if properly enlarged can have a complete school system up through the senior high school. The same would be true in the planning of highways and other services.

(d) The ability to employ with economy able and well trained men and women for the administration of all local services.

(e) The provision of better, more modern equipment, and the economical and efficient use of it, whereas small units either cannot afford to buy it, or if they do, must leave it standing idle for long periods, and get only partial use of it.

(f) The introduction of modern methods of administration and business management, such as accounting systems, financial control, central purchasing, and many others.

(g) The better education of voters in the modern problems of public administration, something they cannot gain at all from the primitive and backward small unit.

(h) More and better service for the same expenditure, or equally good service with less expense.

(i) Easier state supervision of local finances and services, without the necessity for state control or the destruction of local self-government. The surest bulwark against the loss of home rule, it is argued, is the strengthening of weak local units,—to make them so strong that they can stand on their own feet.

Those who are moderate in their claims make it clear, of course, that enlarging units of government does not of itself ensure these improvements. What it does is to make possible changes which are prevented when local administration is in the hands of an excessive number of unequal units, mostly small and weak.

Whether these arguments are all sound or not, it is certain that the present system of local units in many parts of the United States is in a chaotic condition. No amount of historical explanation as to how the local units arose can justify the discrepancies that now exist. In the same state there will be counties with great wealth and hundreds of thousands of people, and counties of less than ten thousand inhabitants and very small taxable resources. Both are supposed to render the same services, and through much the same sort of organization. Furthermore, one state will have over ten thousand local units and another of about equal population only a few hundred, to render much the same services. It is not on record that any state has complained recently that it has too few local units, but there are widespread complaints in many states that there are too many.

More serious than the discrepancies in the size of counties is the utter weakness of many towns and townships, school districts, and other special districts. Little places of very small population and limited resources have been given legal power to do what they are financially and otherwise unable to do well, or even to do at all. Many have been forced to cease functioning in recent years. Others are kept going only through state and national aid. Even in better times their services were conducted on a low plane of efficiency and did not really give the local residents the educational service, the roads, the police and health protection, which an American standard of living demanded and attained in larger places.

In many states of the union not much change in local units is required. The New England states, and some southern and western states already have relatively few and large units. What goal is set by those who would reorganize local units elsewhere? They seem to have two main principles in mind:

1. As nearly as possible there should be only one unit of local government in any area. (a) Each city of sufficient size, including its suburbs, should be one unit, with both county and city powers. There would thus be a single city-county government. School administration might be either a part of the work of this one unit, or there might be a separately elected school board for the same area with some independence. (b) In the rural areas, including smaller cities and villages, the county would be the principal unit of local government, handling important matters like roads, police, finance, health, and welfare, for the whole area, and education would also be handled on the same county-wide basis, perhaps by a county school board. Naturally the smaller cities and villages in the counties would have their own charters and power to provide services needed only within their limits and not needed outside. In such incorporated places there would be two layers of local government—the county, and the city or village.

2. Each city-county and each county should be sufficiently large to provide modern services in its area in a modern, economical, and effective way. Perhaps no city should be a separate county unless it has 35,000 or more inhabitants. As nearly as geography would permit it, also, the rural counties should have populations not below this figure, but other factors need to be considered in reorganizing their boundaries. Convenience of layout with respect to the county seat, the number of miles of road and whether it is sufficient to keep a modern county highway department well employed, and numerous other tests need to be applied. In many cases a county might be well above 35,000 population, and in other cases it would probably have to be below it. There are obviously many exceptional cases.

If American local government were to be reorganized in this way, the really important units would be reduced to about one-tenth of the present number. School districts and other special districts would be eliminated as effective administrative units and so would most townships throughout the middle east and middle west, although many might remain with reduced functions. The really active units would be about 350 city-counties, about 2,000 other counties, about 15,000 incorporated places within the latter counties, and possibly 500 other local units, or a total of about 17,850.

This would seem to necessitate some very drastic action on the part of the states. Perhaps this would ultimately have to take place, but it is not seriously suggested for immediate and wholesale action. There are several alternatives which point in the same direction.

With respect to townships, one alternative is to enact statutes providing for voluntary dissolution, and another is to provide for transferring their more important functions, such as road maintenance and poor relief to the county. Many have already given up their more expensive services without compulsion, and many also fail now to elect some officers authorized by law. Whether they go through the formality of dissolving or not, many towns are in fact ceasing to function. By very force of circumstances they are in many places taking the course of the English parish. They hold on to existence, but have ceased or are ceasing to have any real effect on the major functions of local administration. It would perhaps be more logical, thorough, and systematic to abolish them outright, but that is not really necessary.

The common school district, most numerous of all local units, will be more resistant to change. An optional law for establishing the county as the school unit might have some effect, but in general would meet with little success at present in the middle west. Control of the local school is a plum of some value. The states might find ways of hastening consolidations and the creation of county units through the use of state aid, but this is a matter to which more thought needs to be given. Some one wiser than Solomon is needed, for the school reorganizer in a modern democracy cannot hold sword in hand.

If the necessity for local government reorganization continues, and if the various optional methods of bringing about needed changes do not produce results commensurate with the efforts put forth, the state legislatures may have to begin to exercise a power and a duty which is really theirs. That is the duty to define the units of local administration and their boundaries. American states have in the main left this important matter to local choice, as if it were a part of the power of local self-government. Truly defined the power of local self-government is the power of the local people to manage their own affairs within the areas defined for them. The state needs to define the areas, in the interests of all, and to do this should provide for a thorough study by an official commission of the whole local area problem.

# Metropolitan Districts*

By Albert Lepawsky

*Research Associate, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago*

ALMOST one-half of the population of the United States lives in metropolitan areas. To be more exact, the ninety-six metropolitan districts of the United States which are listed in the accompanying table contain 54,753,645 inhabitants or 44.6 per cent of the entire nation's population.

Numerous definitions of the metropolitan district have been evolved by officials, political scientists, business men, and sociologists, but the official definition in most general use is that adopted by the United States Bureau of the Census. The essential factors which make up the metropolitan district so defined are: (1) a central city of 50,000 plus, (2) a surrounding area bringing the total population up to 100,000, including (3) all adjacent and contiguous civil divisions with a density of at least 150 inhabitants per square mile.[1] This definition of the metropolitan district is based upon a number of urban, suburban, and regional phenomena, including telephone, electric and gas service, retail store delivery, commutation, water supply, newspaper delivery, mail delivery, freight switching, sewer service, club membership, real estate operations, soliciting and collecting routes.

The distinctive features of the metropolitan community are three-fold:

(1) *A concentration of population in metropolitan areas.* The 44.6 per cent of America's metropolitan inhabitants are squeezed into 1.06

---

* Further information of a general and specific nature on the subject of the metropolitan area may be obtained from the following works: (1) National Municipal League, *The Government of Metropolitan Areas in the United States* (New York, National Municipal League, 1930), analyzes the general problem with detailed references to particular cities. (2) United States Bureau of the Census, *Metropolitan Districts: Population and Area* (1932), presents complete statistical data with maps and detailed population analyses of each of the 96 metropolitan districts. (3) Merriam, Parratt, and Lepawsky, *The Government of the Metropolitan Region of Chicago* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1933), shows the structural confusion of the metropolitan area; describes how the rigid metropolitan system works; and indicates the way out of the metropolitan jungle not only for metropolitan Chicago but for metropolitan districts throughout the United States. (4) Roland D. McKenzie, *The Metropolitan Community* (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1933), gives detailed treatment to the social and economic rather than the governmental aspects of metropolitan areas.

[1] The Bureau of the Census has not been able to apply this criterion rigidly. In certain districts there have been included civil divisions of less than the required density which are "directly contiguous to the central cities or are entirely or nearly surrounded by minor civil divisions that have the required density." The Bureau admits that "a clear definition of such metropolitan regions, capable of application to all situations, is still to be worked out."

per cent of the land area of the United States. That is, 54,753,645 out of America's 122,775,046 inhabitants live in 31,982 out of 3,026,789 square miles of United States territory.

(2) *Diffusion of population within the metropolitan district.* One out of three metropolitan inhabitants, "metropolitanites" we may call them, lives outside the central city, but within the outlying areas of the metropolitan district. More precisely, taking all the 96 regions together, 16,939,035 out of 54,753,645 metropolitanites or 30.9 per cent of the total, do not live within the boundaries of the city which is the commercial, cultural, and frequently the political hub of the entire district, and which gives the district its name and its peculiar characteristics.

(3) *A high degree of daily mobility between the central city and the outlying areas of the district.* People, ideas, and goods flow along the roadways, tramways, railways, and powerways of the metropolitan region with a speed and a constancy not found elsewhere. Boundaries of cities, towns, counties, even of states which criss-cross the metropolitan district are disregarded in this flow of daily intercourse. In a district like Metropolitan Chicago, for example, 400,000 persons enter the city by motor alone each day from the surrounding region, not counting tens of thousands more who commute daily by electric or steam railways. One out of every six vehicles entering the central business district on a typical summer's day comes from the outlying region. In the same manner business and social life, crime and recreation, produce a highly fluid picture on a metropolitan, not merely on a local scale.

These basic factors which characterize the metropolitan community produce the distinctive governmental problems of the metropolitan districts. Broadly these problems are:

(1) *Duplication and overlapping of governments.* The table shows the number of independent incorporated units, the number of counties, and the number of separate states within each district. So many independent authorities make the complexities of metropolitan government doubly difficult because they not only stretch along in a continuous chain from central city to the region's periphery, but they also overlap with each other in the same areas. In a place like the metropolitan region of Chicago alone, a city, a township, a school board, a county, a sanitary district, a forest preserve district, even a separate mosquito-abatement district, are piled upon each other in the company of similar series of political units which total in the larger fifty-mile metropolitan region as defined in the Merriam report of 1933, as high as 1,642 independent governments.

(2) *Disintegrated or duplicated local service.* Crime, water supply, fire fighting, transportation, utilities, justice, public works, and welfare are coming to be governmental problems, metropolitan, not merely local,

in scope, just as people and enterprise move and live and operate on a wider regional and metropolitan scale. But local government services, with some exceptions, are still restricted to the overlapping and minute municipal boundaries which network the metropolitan district.

(3) *Excessive expenditures and duplicated personnel.* Duplicated governments and services naturally result in governmental expenditures and in activities of public personnel which could well be economized, if there were a greater degree of governmental integration. Estimates on the probable financial savings vary, and theories about merging personnel and purchasing and other overhead governmental activities are many. Whatever the precise savings might be, there is agreement on all hands that simplification and rationalization of the structure of government, particularly in metropolitan regions, is in the long run a substantial matter of dollars and cents.

(4) *Difficulty of governmental control and supervision.* Administrative supervision over the vital functions of the expanding metropolitan community and civic supervision by means of the ballot are well-nigh impossible under the existing conditions. There are not only too many legal units, budgets, and public payrolls, but there are also too many independently selected authorities, too many long ballots, to permit any form of effective official control or civic supervision. More than that, comprehensive planning and development of the metropolitan region, except perhaps from the standpoint of the gross physical features of the area, are out of the question where there is no single guiding authority responsible for the general governmental problems of the metropolitan district.

Several possible solutions for the problems of metropolitan government have been suggested:

(1) *Intermunicipal arrangements.* With boundaries remaining practically as they are, neighboring and overlapping governments of the metropolitan district may merge services and personnel, either by contract or by informal collaboration and co-operation. To take one pertinent example from the Chicago region, the police force of 54 suburbs are hooked up with Chicago's central complaint department and police radio broadcast station, receiving radio calls just as do the squad cars within the city itself.

(2) *Annexation of territory.* This is one of the oldest but slowest methods of broadening the area of the central city. In the last few decades annexations have been few with the exception of such wholesale enlargements of city areas as that of Los Angeles during the famous "shoestring" addition of San Pedro and Wilmington in 1906-09.

(3) *City-county separation and consolidation.* Since the county is generally the principal local authority aside from the central metropolitan

city itself, a large step toward integration is taken when the city and county consolidate or even when the city separates from the county and sets up an independent county of its own. Some of the best-known of city-county reorganizations are the St. Louis arrangement of 1875, the Denver arrangement of 1903, and the New York arrangement of 1898.

(4) *Federation of local areas*. With no or with little disturbance of existing boundaries the metropolitan area may attain a higher degree of co-ordination by means of federation. Autonomy over many local functions may be left in the hands of the existing units of government while general functions may be assigned to the federated authority. One of the best examples of the federated district is the county of London, the world's largest metropolis, with its federation of twenty-eight boroughs and the old city of London.

(5) *Special metropolitan authorities*. For particular functions, or groups of functions, special or *ad hoc* metropolitan districts have been organized. The New York Port Authority, a leading example of such a district, is of particular interest because it indicates how the functions of a special district may grow and accumulate, finally covering a whole range of subjects from harbor supervision to suburban transit.

(6) *Inter- and intra-state arrangements*. Metropolitan government is frequently handicapped by the dominant and inflexible control exercised by state authorities and by the existence of state lines which cut across the region, as in New York, Chicago, or St. Louis. A variety of arrangements, including home rule, federal services to the cities, and interstate agreements between the state sections of the metropolitan district have been suggested and in many instances have been put into operation to the advantage of government for the entire metropolitan area.

In spite of the available solutions, genuine metropolitan reorganization has made little progress in the United States. The obstacles or objections have been threefold:

(1) *Local sentiment*. Municipal freedom is an historic principle as well as a popular stereotype in American government and it is invariably raised as a rallying standard for those who object to plans depriving suburbs and local authorities of their independence.

(2) *Taxation*. Invariably this local sentiment is tied up with and strengthened by the advantageous financial position of suburbs and of metropolitan authorities having the higher property values. Any plan which would merge these units of government with larger areas would have a tendency to burden them with higher tax bills than the poorer districts in order to finance the general budget of the larger unit.

(3) *Political inertia*. Metropolitan reorganization must also face the obstacle of general resistance to governmental change and the particular

resistance of special political groups, including officials and officeholders who fear the loss of office or of patronage in the course of the shifts in political control which accompany the reorganization of local governments.

The latest tendencies in the reconstruction of metropolitan government show:

(1) *Continued interest in wider areas of urban government.* Studies involving the metropolitan districts of Milwaukee, Los Angeles, Detroit, Cleveland, and Birmingham are now supplementing the comprehensive surveys and studies made in metropolitan Chicago and New York.

(2) *Strengthening of the lines of government between the metropolitan regions and Washington.* The growth of federal services and control has brought with it a greater dependence, especially on the part of large urban centers and regions, upon federal funds and upon federal administrative guidance.

(3) *Strengthening of the larger metropolitan units, particularly the county.* We can note here the tendency to transfer city functions from the city to the county, the movement to create the county into a full-fledged municipal corporation, the improvement of the county's administrative structure and techniques of government, the growth of the county home rule movement, and the increase in the number of county-manager counties.

### NOTES ON TABLE II

[1] The "principal central cities" refer to the cities which enter into the name of the metropolitan district. These and other cities with a population of more than 50,000 in districts which have more than one such city are listed with their population in footnotes 6 to 31.

[2] Percentages cannot be computed because comparable data for 1920 are not available.

[3] Parishes, instead of counties in Louisiana.

[4] In this table the following cities are included in the total for "outside cities" while these same cities, in the Bureau of Census report, are listed as central cities within the larger metropolitan district: New York-N. E. New Jersey District: Elizabeth (114,589), Jersey City (316,715), Newark (442,337), Paterson (138,513); St. Louis District: East St. Louis (74,347); total population of five cities 1,086,501. (Accounting for difference between totals in this table and Bureau of the Census table.)

[5] Does not include 11 districts for which information was not available; see footnote 2.

(See page 135 for remaining notes on Table II)

# TABLE II

## METROPOLITAN DISTRICTS OF THE UNITED STATES*

Source: Bureau of the Census, *Metropolitan Districts, Population, and Area,* 1932

| Metropolitan District | Total Population, 1930 | Pop. of Central Cities, 1930[1] | Pop. Outside Central Cities, 1930 | Per Cent Pop. Outside Central Cities | Per Cent Increase Total Pop. 1920–1930 | Land Area 1930 (sq. mi.) | Population Per Square Mile, 1930 | Number Incorporated Places, 1930 | Number Counties 1930 | Number Cities Over 50,000, 1930 | Number States Covered (if more than one) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Akron, Ohio | 346,681 | 255,040 | 91,641 | 26.4 | 20.2 | 242.78 | 1,428.0 | 11 | 3 | 1 | |
| Albany, Schenectady, Troy, N. Y. | 425,259 | 295,867 | 129,392 | 30.4 | 12.7 | 472.45 | 900.1 | 14 | 4 | 3[6] | |
| Allentown, Bethlehem, Easton, Pa. | 322,172 | 184,923 | 137,249 | 42.6 | 14.6 | 334.53 | 962.8 | 25 | 4 | 2[7] | 2 |
| Altoona, Pa. | 114,232 | 82,054 | 32,178 | 28.2 | 9.9 | 133.06 | 858.5 | 9 | 2 | 1 | |
| Atlanta, Ga. | 370,920 | 270,366 | 100,554 | 27.1 | 42.4 | 221.31 | 1,676.0 | 8 | 4 | 1 | |
| Atlantic City, N. J. | 102,024 | 66,198 | 35,826 | 35.1 | 57.0 | 52.77 | 1,933.4 | 11 | 2 | 1 | |
| Baltimore, Md. | 949,247 | 804,874 | 144,373 | 15.2 | 16.1 | 558.51 | 1,699.6 | 5 | 4 | 1 | |
| Binghamton, N. Y. | 130,005 | 76,662 | 53,343 | 41.0 | 31.7 | 183.19 | 709.7 | 4 | 1 | 1 | |
| Birmingham, Ala. | 382,792 | 259,678 | 123,114 | 32.2 | 43.5 | 307.86 | 1,243.4 | 10 | 1 | 1 | |
| Boston, Mass. | 2,307,897 | 781,188 | 1,526,709 | 66.1 | 14.9 | 1,022.60 | 2,256.9 | 19 | 6 | 9[8] | |
| Bridgeport, Conn. | 203,969 | 146,716 | 57,253 | 28.1 | 9.9 | 169.33 | 1,204.6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| Buffalo, Niagara Falls, N. Y. | 820,573 | 648,536 | 172,037 | 21.0 | 22.1 | 458.85 | 1,778.3 | 15 | 2 | 2[9] | |
| Canton, Ohio | 191,231 | 104,906 | 86,325 | 45.1 | 24.7 | 238.38 | 802.2 | 7 | 1 | 1 | |
| Charleston, W. Va. | 108,160 | 60,408 | 47,752 | 44.1 | 48.1 | 276.78 | 390.8 | 5 | 1 | 1 | |
| Chattanooga, Tenn. | 168,589 | 119,798 | 48,791 | 28.9 | [2] | 489.72 | 344.3 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Chicago, Ill. | 4,364,755 | 3,376,438 | 988,317 | 22.6 | 33.4 | 1,119.29 | 3,899.6 | 115 | 5 | 7[10] | 2 |
| Cincinnati, Ohio | 759,464 | 451,160 | 308,304 | 40.6 | 20.4 | 519.56 | 1,461.7 | 44 | 7 | 2[11] | 3 |
| Cleveland, Ohio | 1,194,989 | 900,429 | 294,560 | 24.6 | 27.7 | 310.20 | 3,852.3 | 41 | 2 | 3[12] | |
| Columbus, Ohio | 340,400 | 290,564 | 49,836 | 14.6 | 27.3 | 219.17 | 1,553.1 | 11 | 1 | 1 | |
| Dallas, Tex. | 309,658 | 260,475 | 49,183 | 15.9 | 58.3 | 504.42 | 613.9 | 10 | 1 | 1 | |
| Davenport, Ia. | 154,491 | 60,751 | 93,740 | 60.7 | 6.8 | 126.55 | 1,220.8 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Dayton, Ohio | 251,928 | 200,982 | 50,946 | 20.2 | 33.0 | 180.12 | 1,398.7 | 6 | 1 | 1 | |
| Denver, Colo. | 330,761 | 287,861 | 42,900 | 13.0 | 18.0 | 305.09 | 1,084.1 | 10 | 3 | 1 | |
| Des Moines, Ia. | 160,963 | 142,559 | 18,404 | 11.4 | 14.8 | 203.07 | 792.6 | 5 | 1 | 1 | |
| Detroit, Mich. | 2,104,764 | 1,568,662 | 536,102 | 25.5 | 68.0 | 746.52 | 2,819.4 | 43 | 3 | 5[13] | |
| Duluth, Minn. | 155,390 | 101,463 | 53,927 | 34.7 | 1.4 | 443.65 | 350.3 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| El Paso, Tex. | 118,461 | 102,421 | 16,040 | 13.5 | 25.7 | 290.82 | 407.3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Erie, Pa. | 129,817 | 115,967 | 13,850 | 10.7 | 18.1 | 89.00 | 1,458.6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| Evansville, Ind. | 123,130 | 102,249 | 20,881 | 17.0 | 19.8 | 148.60 | 828.6 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Flint, Mich. | 179,939 | 156,492 | 23,447 | 13.0 | 74.8 | 141.44 | 1,272.2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| Fort Wayne, Ind. | 126,558 | 114,946 | 11,612 | 09.2 | 33.6 | 138.58 | 913.2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| Fort Worth, Tex. | 174,575 | 163,447 | 11,128 | 06.4 | 34.6 | 170.60 | 1,023.3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |

### Table II—Metropolitan Districts of the United States—Continued

| Metropolitan District | Total Population, 1930 | Pop. of Central Cities, 1930[1] | Pop. Outside Central Cities, 1930 | Per Cent Pop. Outside Central Cities | Per Cent Increase Total Pop. 1920–1930 | Land Area 1930 (sq. mi.) | Population Per Square Mile, 1930 | Number Incorporated Places, 1930 | Number Counties 1930 | Number Cities Over 50,000, 1930 | Number States Covered (if more than one) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grand Rapids, Mich. | 207,154 | 168,592 | 38,562 | 18.6 | 34.3 | 136.35 | 1,519.3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | |
| Harrisburg, Pa. | 161,672 | 80,339 | 81,333 | 50.3 | 11.6 | 129.52 | 1,248.2 | 16 | 3 | 1 | |
| Hartford, Conn. | 471,185 | 164,072 | 307,113 | 65.2 | 23.4 | 565.05 | 833.9 | 9 | 4 | 2[14] | |
| Houston, Tex. | 339,216 | 292,352 | 46,864 | 13.8 | [2] | 799.20 | 424.4 | 9 | 1 | 1 | |
| Huntington, W. Va.; Ashland, Ky. | 163,367 | 104,646 | 58,721 | 35.9 | 42.2 | 264.27 | 618.2 | 13 | 5 | 1[15] | 3 |
| Indianapolis, Ind. | 417,685 | 364,161 | 53,524 | 12.8 | 21.5 | 311.75 | 1,339.8 | 17 | 1 | 1 | |
| Jacksonville, Fla. | 148,713 | 129,549 | 19,164 | 12.9 | [2] | 218.06 | 682.0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| Johnstown, Pa. | 147,611 | 66,993 | 80,618 | 54.6 | 3.9 | 179.90 | 820.5 | 19 | 2 | 1 | |
| Kan. City, Kan.; Kan. City, Mo. | 608,186 | 521,603 | 86,583 | 14.2 | 26.7 | 454.51 | 1,338.1 | 9 | 4 | 2[16] | 2 |
| Knoxville, Tenn. | 135,714 | 105,802 | 29,912 | 22.0 | 41.6 | 192.63 | 704.5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Lancaster, Pa. | 123,156 | 59,949 | 63,207 | 51.3 | 16.7 | 231.70 | 531.5 | 7 | 1 | 1 | |
| Little Rock, Ark. | 113,137 | 81,679 | 31,458 | 27.8 | 27.9 | 108.99 | 1,038.0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | |
| Los Angeles, Calif. | 2,318,526 | 1,238,048 | 1,080,478 | 46.6 | [2] | 1,474.34 | 1,572.6 | 56 | 3 | 4[17] | |
| Louisville, Ky. | 404,396 | 307,745 | 96,651 | 23.9 | 22.5 | 463.92 | 871.7 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Lowell, Lawrence, Mass. | 332,028 | 185,302 | 146,726 | 44.2 | — 3.1 | 292.18 | 1,136.4 | 4 | 2 | 2[18] | |
| Memphis, Tenn. | 276,126 | 253,143 | 22,983 | 08.3 | [2] | 221.16 | 1,248.5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Miami, Fla. | 132,189 | 110,637 | 21,552 | 16.3 | [2] | 111.56 | 1,184.9 | 7 | 1 | 1 | |
| Milwaukee, Wis. | 743,414 | 578,249 | 165,165 | 22.2 | 34.4 | 241.70 | 3,075.8 | 12 | 2 | 1 | |
| Minneapolis, St. Paul, Minn. | 832,258 | 735,962 | 96,296 | 11.6 | 22.3 | 525.37 | 1,584.1 | 35 | 5 | 2[19] | |
| Nashville, Tenn. | 209,422 | 153,866 | 55,556 | 26.5 | 34.0 | 323.36 | 647.6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| New Haven, Conn. | 293,724 | 162,655 | 131,069 | 44.6 | 13.4 | 249.07 | 1,179.3 | 6 | 1 | 1 | |
| New Orleans, La. | 494,877 | 458,762 | 36,115 | 07.3 | [2] | 287.02 | 1,724.2 | 3 | 3[8] | 1 | |
| New York, N. E. New Jersey | 10,901,424 | 6,930,446 | 3,970,978 | 36.4 | 28.2 | 2,514.11 | 4,336.1 | 272 | 19 | 14[20] | 3 |
| Norfolk, Portsmouth, Newport News, Va. | 273,233 | 209,831 | 63,402 | 23.2 | — 8.3 | 468.59 | 583.1 | 6 | 3 | 1[21] | |
| Oklahoma City, Okla. | 202,163 | 185,389 | 16,774 | 08.3 | 100.6 | 181.78 | 1,112.1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | |
| Omaha, Council Bluffs, Ia. | 273,851 | 256,054 | 17,797 | 06.5 | 14.9 | 204.98 | 1,336.0 | 3 | 3 | 1[22] | 2 |
| Peoria, Ill. | 144,732 | 104,969 | 39,763 | 27.5 | 36.2 | 105.54 | 1,371.3 | 6 | 2 | 1 | |
| Philadelphia, Pa. | 2,847,148 | 1,950,961 | 896,187 | 31.5 | 16.1 | 993.89 | 2,864.7 | 92 | 8 | 3[23] | 2 |
| Pittsburgh, Pa. | 1,953,668 | 669,817 | 1,283,851 | 65.7 | 15.1 | 1,626.05 | 1,201.5 | 135 | 6 | 2[24] | |
| Portland, Ore. | 378,728 | 301,815 | 76,913 | 20.3 | [2] | 277.46 | 1,365.0 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Providence, R. I.; Fall River, New Bedford, Mass. | 963,686 | 480,852 | 482,834 | 50.1 | 9.7 | 817.83 | 1,178.3 | 9 | 7 | 4[25] | 2 |
| Racine, Kenosha, Wis. | 133,463 | 117,804 | 15,659 | 11.7 | 19.9 | 185.20 | 720.6 | 3 | 2 | 2[26] | |
| Reading, Pa. | 170,486 | 111,171 | 59,315 | 34.8 | 18.0 | 157.07 | 1,085.4 | 14 | 1 | 1 | |
| Richmond, Va. | 220,513 | 182,929 | 37,584 | 17.0 | 13.1 | 334.60 | 659.0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | |
| Roanoke, Va. | 103,120 | 69,206 | 33,914 | 32.9 | 43.2 | 231.00 | 446.4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | |
| Rochester, N. Y. | 398,591 | 328,132 | 70,459 | 17.7 | 21.2 | 304.24 | 1,310.1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | |
| Rockford, Ill. | 103,204 | 85,864 | 17,340 | 16.8 | 31.3 | 138.77 | 743.7 | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| Sacramento, Calif. | 126,995 | 93,750 | 33,245 | 26.2 | 49.9 | 462.02 | 274.9 | 2 | 2 | 1 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| St. Louis, Mo. | 1,293,516 | 821,960 | 471,556 | 36.4 | 20.7 | 821.54 | 1,574.5 | 48 | 4 | 2[27] | 2 |
| Salt Lake City, Utah | 184,451 | 140,267 | 44,184 | 23.9 | 20.8 | 450.85 | 409.1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | |
| San Antonio, Tex. | 279,271 | 231,542 | 47,729 | 17.1 | 47.5 | 467.34 | 597.6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | |
| San Diego, Calif. | 181,020 | 147,995 | 33,025 | 18.2 | [2] | 332.37 | 544.6 | 5 | 1 | 1 | |
| San Francisco, Oakland, Calif. | 1,290,094 | 918,457 | 371,637 | 28.8 | 33.8 | 825.60 | 1,562.6 | 38 | 6 | 3[28] | |
| San Jose, Calif. | 103,428 | 57,651 | 45,777 | 44.3 | [2] | 210.39 | 491.6 | 6 | 1 | 1 | |
| Savannah, Ga. | 105,431 | 85,024 | 20,407 | 19.4 | 5.4 | 370.01 | 284.9 | 4 | 1 | 1 | |
| Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, Pa. | 652,312 | 230,059 | 422,253 | 64.7 | 10.5 | 394.73 | 1,652.6 | 52 | 4 | 2[29] | |
| Seattle, Wash. | 420,663 | 365,583 | 55,080 | 13.1 | 20.0 | 209.90 | 2,004.1 | 6 | 3 | 1 | |
| South Bend, Ind. | 146,569 | 104,193 | 42,376 | 28.9 | 59.1 | 153.60 | 954.2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | |
| Spokane, Wash. | 128,798 | 115,514 | 13,284 | 10.3 | 9.0 | 270.25 | 476.6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| Springfield, Holyoke, Mass. | 398,991 | 206,437 | 192,554 | 48.3 | 10.9 | 518.69 | 769.2 | 5 | 3 | 2[30] | 2 |
| Syracuse, N. Y. | 245,015 | 209,326 | 35,689 | 14.6 | 22.0 | 139.73 | 1,753.5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | |
| Tacoma, Wash. | 146,771 | 106,817 | 39,954 | 27.2 | 15.3 | 190.67 | 769.8 | 9 | 2 | 1 | |
| Tampa, St. Petersburg, Fla. | 169,010 | 141,586 | 27,424 | 16.2 | [2] | 266.18 | 634.9 | 6 | 2 | 1[31] | |
| Toledo, Ohio | 346,530 | 290,718 | 55,812 | 16.1 | 26.0 | 204.36 | 1,695.7 | 6 | 2 | 1 | |
| Trenton, N. J. | 190,219 | 123,356 | 66,863 | 35.1 | 17.2 | 172.97 | 1,099.7 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Tulsa, Okla. | 183,207 | 141,258 | 41,949 | 22.9 | 75.5 | 391.40 | 468.1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | |
| Utica, N. Y. | 190,918 | 101,740 | 89,178 | 46.7 | 9.2 | 358.15 | 533.1 | 11 | 2 | 1 | |
| Washington, D. C. | 621,059 | 486,869 | 134,190 | 21.6 | 18.4 | 484.99 | 1,280.6 | 27 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| Waterbury, Conn. | 140,575 | 99,902 | 40,673 | 28.9 | 8.8 | 206.66 | 680.2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | |
| Wheeling, W. Va. | 190,623 | 61,659 | 128,964 | 67.6 | 11.8 | 399.31 | 477.4 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| Wichita, Kan. | 119,174 | 111,110 | 8,064 | 06.8 | 56.9 | 142.97 | 833.6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Wilmington, Del. | 163,592 | 106,597 | 56,995 | 34.8 | 7.4 | 228.64 | 715.5 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Worcester, Mass. | 305,293 | 195,311 | 109,982 | 36.0 | 10.3 | 399.56 | 764.1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | |
| Youngstown, Ohio | 364,560 | 170,002 | 194,558 | 53.4 | 28.6 | 363.47 | 1,003.0 | 15 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| TOTALS | 54,753,645 | 36,728,109[4] | 18,025,536[4] | 32.9[4] | 24.9[5] | 36,577.87 | 1,496.9 | 1,566 | 251 | 153 | |

The following footnotes list cities over 50,000 population in each district where there is more than one such city, and cities with less than 50,000 population that enter into the name of a district: [For notes one to five see page 132.]

[6] Albany (127,412); Schenectady (95,692); Troy (72,763).

[7] Allentown (92,563); Bethlehem (57,892); Easton (34,468).

[8] Boston (781,188); Brockton (63,797); Cambridge (113,643); Lynn (102,320); Malden (58,036); Medford (59,714); Newton (65,276); Quincy (71,983); Somerville (103,908).

[9] Buffalo (573,076); Niagara Falls (75,460).

[10] Chicago (3,376,438); Cicero (66,602); East Chicago, Indiana (54,784); Evanston (63,338); Gary, Indiana (100,426); Hammond, Indiana (64,560); Oak Park (63,982).

[11] Cincinnati (451,160); Covington, Kentucky (65,252).

[12] Cleveland (900,429); Cleveland Heights (50,945); Lakewood (70,509).

[13] Detroit (1,568,662); Dearborn (50,358); Hamtramck (56,268); Highland Park (52,959); Pontiac (64,928).

[14] Hartford (164,072); New Britain (68,128).

[15] Huntington (75,572); Ashland (29,074).

[16] Kansas City, Kansas (121,857); Kansas City, Missouri (399,746).

[17] Los Angeles (1,238,048); Glendale (62,736); Long Beach (142,032); Pasadena (76,086).

[18] Lowell (100,234); Lawrence (85,068).

[19] Minneapolis (464,356); St. Paul (271,606).

[20] New York (6,930,446); Mt. Vernon (61,499); New Rochelle (54,000); Yonkers (134,646); Elizabeth, New Jersey (114,589); Jersey City, New Jersey (316,715); Newark, New Jersey (442,337); Paterson, New Jersey (138,513); Bayonne, New Jersey (88,979); East Orange, New Jersey (68,020); Hoboken, New Jersey (59,261); Irvington, New Jersey (56,733); Passaic, New Jersey (62,959); Union City, New Jersey (58,659).

[21] Norfolk (129,710); Portsmouth (45,704); Newport News (34,417).

[22] Omaha (214,006); Council Bluffs (42,048).

[23] Philadelphia (1,950,961); Camden, New Jersey (118,700); Chester, Pennsylvania (59,164).

[24] Pittsburgh (669,817); McKeesport (54,632).

[25] Providence (252,981); Fall River, Massachusetts (115,274); New Bedford, Massachusetts (112,597); Pawtucket, Rhode Island (77,149).

[26] Racine (67,542); Kenosha (50,262).

[27] St. Louis (821,960); East St. Louis, Illinois (74,347).

[28] San Francisco (634,394); Oakland (284,063); Berkeley (82,109).

[29] Scranton (143,433); Wilkes-Barre (86,626).

[30] Springfield (149,900); Holyoke (56,537).

[31] Tampa (101,161); St. Petersburg (40,425).

# Legal Classification of Cities by States

BY GEORGE C. S. BENSON AND MARY S. BENSON

HOW do states classify cities and what forms of government do they prescribe for them? How widely are optional forms of city government provided? Is there any value in population differentiation? Are optional provisions and home rule provisions of any real importance? What is the position of the mayor in the various forms of government? This study attempts to answer some of these questions, and discuss the general trend—while the accompanying state-by-state notes give the provisions—of classificatory codes of municipal government.*

Unwary readers should be warned that the road to these answers is full of pitfalls. Limitations of time and space have made it impossible to catalog all provisions of special acts governing municipalities. Code provisions frequently apply to very few cities, as noted below. Oftentimes cities may outgrow population limits without changing their status.

*Types of State Codes.* Variations of state codes are so numerous as almost to defy classification. For purposes of convenience, however, an effort is made here to point out certain major groups. Certain states are placed in more than one group because their laws vary for different classes of municipalities.

Most sharply defined is the group of six New England states with their town meetings and boards of selectmen, tempered by a few optional provisions for the manager plan. There is no need to elaborate here on the large number of elective officers, the close popular control of the budget, or other features of this ultra-democratic system. It satisfies the New Englanders—if one is to judge by the absence of home rule in Yankeeland and by the relatively small attention paid to city laws in all the six states except Massachusetts. In the other five states cities operate under special charters.

Seventeen states (Arizona, California, Colorado, Maryland,[1] Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri,[2] Nebraska, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon,

---

Editor's Note: Mr. Benson is director of publications, American Legislators' Association, and managing editor of *State Government.*

* The form of government for every city over 10,000 is given in Table III this YEAR BOOK—Editor.

[1] Maryland has home rule in Baltimore only.

[2] Home Rule applies only to St. Louis and Kansas City.

Pennsylvania,[3] Texas, Utah, Washington[4] and Wisconsin[5]) have home rule provisions in their constitutions which make them more or less of a group apart.

Well-defined optional charter provisions exist in Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Montana, New Mexico, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Virginia, and Wisconsin. These are grouped separately because they give almost all cities option as to the three major forms of local government.

States whose codes allow freedom of choice between the three standard forms (and possibly other forms) to certain classes of cities can be roughly called loose classifiers. Somewhat tentatively Arkansas, Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Missouri, Nevada, South Carolina, and Wyoming may be placed in this heterogeneous collection.

Even more tentatively a group of states may be described as rigid classifiers because their state laws give relatively little leeway to municipalities. Alabama (with practically no allowance for manager form), Indiana (which has at present only mayor-council government), Mississippi, Pennsylvania, and Washington (cities below 20,000) are in this class.

A final group of states—in the East and Southeast—govern municipalities almost entirely by special charters, frequently with hodgepodge results. Delaware, Maryland (except Baltimore), Florida,[6] Georgia, Tennessee, and West Virginia are included in this group. Many other states have a few cities or towns under special charter. It is probably fair to say that these six states and those with rigid classification are most restrictive of municipal freedom in charter making. It is not, however, a fair assumption that forms of municipal government are least progressive in these states.

*Constitutional Prohibitions.* In about 40 states the constitution prohibits special or local legislation incorporating municipalities or amending their charters, requires incorporation under general laws, or provides both safeguards against special legislation. Three of these states[7] have constitutional provisions requiring the consent of the inhabitants to the form of local government. The remaining states do not prohibit special charters though some of them govern most of their cities under a system of classification and general law.

There is no close correlation between the list of states which prohibit special charters for cities and those which have set up classification for cities. In general, states where special charters are not prohibited do not have classificatory systems though there are exceptions, notably Indiana with its five classes of cities.

---

[3] Pennsylvania has a constitutional provision but the legislature has never passed an enabling act.

[4] The Washington provision applies only to first class cities (over 20,000).

[5] In Wisconsin and Arizona, the provisions have been little used.

[6] Florida voted a constitutional enabling provision for classification in November, 1934, but the legislature has not yet enacted a classification law.

[7] Massachusetts, Montana, and Pennsylvania.

*Classification by Population.* It is interesting to note the different bases of classification according to population. In Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Maine, Maryland, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont and West Virginia there is no arbitrary statutory distinction between classes of cities or between cities and towns in population and in some cases there is not even a minimum population requirement for incorporation. In Arizona, Florida, Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, and Oklahoma there is a population distinction between cities and towns but no further classification of cities. In Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Nebraska, and Virginia cities are divided into first and second classes. Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, New Jersey, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming have three or more classes of cities. Michigan,[8] California [9] and Alabama [10] should perhaps be included with states having several classes.

What constitutes a small city (that is the lowest population group recognized as cities) varies greatly. In Alabama it is cities under 6,000, Arkansas under 5,000, California under 10,000 (fifth and sixth classes), Idaho 15,000, Indiana 10,000, Kansas 2,000, Michigan 3,000, Minnesota 10,000, Nebraska 5,000, South Dakota 500, and Pennsylvania 100,000.

As can be seen from state notes below, classification of cities does not always affect the forms of government open to the city. Sometimes, classification provisions may be so narrowly drawn as to include only one or two cities.[11] Such classification may be the means of extending needed extra privileges to the larger cities of a state. There is always the danger, however, that classification may be so handled as to amount to special legislation, despite constitutional provisions.

*Mayor-Council Plan.* Turning to forms of municipal government the first problem is to sort out various features of the most frequent form—

---

[8] Michigan still has fourth and fifth class cities for certain purposes—other classes have been superseded by home rule provisions.

[9] California at one time had elaborate classification with subclasses. Some of these are retained though any city may adopt a home rule charter.

[10] Alabama has partial classification of cities for purposes of commission government only.

[11] The following states have classes of cities which are limited to one or two cities: Alabama—Class C, Montgomery; Indiana—First class, Indianapolis; Kentucky—First class, Louisville; Missouri—First class, St. Joseph, and second class, Springfield and Joplin; Nebraska—Metropolitan class, Omaha; Pennsylvania—First class, Philadelphia, second class, Pittsburgh, and second class A, Scranton; Wyoming—Second class, Laramie.

the mayor-council. This is the oldest of the three forms historically and the one for which state codes make the most detailed provisions, partly because it is more complicated than the manager or commission form of government.

The position of the mayor in the council comes first. The most frequent provision is that the mayor is the presiding officer with power to vote only when there is a tie. Where the form of government varies with population, the usual trend is to emphasize separation of powers by taking the mayor out of the council in larger cities. It should be noted that a mayor may sit with a council and preside without being considered a member.

Most state codes give to the mayor a veto which may be overridden by two-thirds vote of the council. As a general rule the veto is not given to mayors of smaller cities and towns, though what constitutes a small city is a matter for varying definition. In a few states like Arizona, Utah, South Carolina, and Georgia, there is no state provision for mayoral veto. One reason for exclusion of the smaller cities is the fact that state codes frequently provide commission government for smaller units. If strict commission government is not prescribed, the mayor is one member of a small council in smaller cities, so a veto seems unnecessary. There may also be a feeling that councils of smaller urban areas can be trusted more fully, or have less power to abuse, so the theory of checks and balances is less essential.

Where the fraction of votes necessary to override a veto changes in accordance with population, it usually becomes smaller in less populous classes of cities. California, Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska are examples.

A surprisingly large number of states have incorporated provisions for item vetoes of appropriation bills. Such clauses are included, for example, in the municipal codes of Alabama (salary measures), Arkansas, California, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky (first and fourth class cities), Missouri (first and third classes), Montana, Nebraska, Ohio, Pennsylvania (first and second classes only), South Dakota and Virginia. If any population trend can be observed in this group it is that the item veto is more likely to be found in the larger cities.

Summarizing the use of classification in state municipal codes on veto power, it may be said that a tendency to place more responsibility on the mayor in larger cities is observable in about a dozen states. Mayors of larger cities are given the veto power; larger fractions are required to override the veto in larger cities; and the mayor of the larger city is more likely to have an item veto.

Code provisions for the terms of mayor and council vary greatly. In twenty-four cases mayor and council serve two years; in six they serve four years; and in two they serve one year. In thirteen states the terms of mayor and council differ. Of this group eight states have a two year term for mayor; three have four years; one three years and one one year. Four have councils with mixed terms of office, five have four year terms, three have two year terms and one a three year term.

*Commission Government.* At least 30 of the states[12] make statutory provision for the adoption of commission government in part or all of their cities. In some of these states it may be set up under home rule charter as well as by statute. Of the remaining states Arizona, Colorado, Michigan, Minnesota, Oklahoma, and Oregon have home rule provisions under which it may be adopted. In most other states cities under special charter may have commission government. There are a few cases in which it is compulsory for small groups of cities but in general it is an optional form. In 14 states[13] any city may adopt the commission form. In the remaining states—where commission government is restricted to certain classes—the classes may range from 1,000 to 200,000. But in most cases the optional class includes cities between 2,000 and 50,000. On the whole legislators seem to favor the plan for cities under 50,000 and above 1,000.

The number of commissioners is generally three or five including the mayor. Many states require three commissioners in smaller cities and five in the larger. In one or two instances the number is fixed at four or seven. Twenty-one states provide that in the commission form the mayor shall be elected by the people. In at least five states the commissioners select one of their number to act as mayor. Three states have not made statutory provision regarding a mayor in this form of government. These mayors do not have veto power nor any power of appointment except as members of the commission. The whole commission is usually the appointing authority. In Iowa, Missouri, and one class of cities in Washington the commissioners are elected for specific departments. More commonly the assignments to departments are made by the commissioners themselves except that the law often provides that the mayor shall be commissioner of public affairs which usually includes the police and fire departments.

Different codes vary greatly in provision of term of office for commissioners. Almost half the states provide four year terms in one or more classes of cities. Five, six, three and two year terms can also be found.

---

[12] Alabama, Arkansas, California, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania (third class), South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

[13] Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Texas, and Virginia.

Sometimes the mayor's term is different from the others.

Cities adopting the commission plan are frequently required to retain it for a specified period of from one to six years before making any change. The general tenor of the correspondence with the several states indicates that the commission form is not increasing and that in some states the number of commission cities is actually decreasing.

*Council-Manager.* Some 28 states [14] have laws permitting the adoption of city manager government by some or all of their cities. Some of the states with statutory provisions for the manager plan are also home rule states and may adopt the form in either way. Eight states [15] do not have optional laws but cities may adopt it under home rule charters. Under home rule provisions and optional laws it is possible in approximately the same number of states as is the commission form.

In fifteen states[16] any city regardless of population may adopt it. In the other states with statutory provision for the manager plan, the specified population ranges from a minimum of 2,000 to a maximum of 150,000. With only one exception the classified groups apply only to cities under 50,000. However, the group of states allowing the managerial form in any city is larger than the group restricting it to certain classes of cities.

The manager is selected by a commission of three or more members or by mayor and council. In most cases the mayor is titular head of the city and serves on ceremonial occasions; he rarely has the power to veto. In approximately half the states the mayor is elected by the people, and in the other half he is a member of the commission or council designated by the other members. Many states specify that the plan must be tried for two to six years before it may be abandoned.

Under the council-manager plan appointments are generally left to the manager. Nevertheless one must not accept too readily the term—city manager—as indicating full possession of the powers usually ascribed to such an officer. In Arkansas and in Illinois, Iowa, Montana, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wyoming the council or commission either appoints a number of important officials or confirms the manager's appointments thus giving him less freedom of action than is customarily expected. These statutes do not conform to the accepted principles of council-manager government.

[14] Alabama, Arkansas, California, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana (the optional provision is almost inoperable), Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania (in boroughs; possibly in Third Class cities), South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

[15] Arizona, Colorado, Michigan, Minnesota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, and Washington.

[16] Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana (except New Orleans), Massachusetts (except Boston), Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, and Wyoming.

Usually the manager's term is at the pleasure of the appointing body. In Illinois cities and villages under 5,000, he serves for the same term as the mayor. In Tennessee he may not be removed for the first twelve months after his appointment except for incompetence or malfeasance. In Virginia he is appointed for three years and may be reappointed for six years but is at all times subject to removal.

*Summary.* In fairness to our lawmakers it must be said that most legislative bodies have been relatively free in giving cities their choice between the three most frequent forms of government in the United States. The situation in the special charter states is indubitably bad—but there are only nine of these. The rigid classification states add only five more. Home rule and generous optional charter states constitute a good half of the members of the Union.

Home rule does not necessarily guarantee adoption of clear-cut and workable plans of municipal organization. There is grave doubt as to the efficiency of citizen judgment on as complicated a matter as forms of government. Experience in states like Arizona and Wisconsin indicates how little value some cities may place on municipal home rule. Although it may be thought that optional charters are a better system, it is interesting to note that only a small fraction of Massachusetts cities have used the excellent optional charter plan of that state.

While a compilation of municipal powers might yield different results, it is apparent that classification by population has little real meaning in forms of municipal government. Few important general trends based on population differences are observable. Where form of government is limited by population, little attention has been paid to the established classification. States with highly elaborate classifications often grant no real variety of forms of government.

*State laws on classification and forms of government.* The following notes on state laws are based on studies of codes and session laws. They have been checked and rechecked—in some cases almost completely rewritten—by the correspondents whose names appear at the end of each state digest. The authors wish to express their gratitude to these men, whose knowledge and patience have made this compilation possible.

## ALABAMA

*Classification:* Cities—Communities over 2,000. Towns are incorporated municipalities of 100 to 2,000. Total of 223 cities and towns. Class C cities, 40,000 to 67,000 population (applying only to Montgomery); Class D cities are 1,000 to 40,000 (Acts of 1931, No. 75) but another act of the same year (Acts of 1931, No. 102) states that Class D cities have 24,000 to 40,000.

*Mayor-Council:* All cities and towns not having commission or manager form have the mayor-council plan by mandatory statutory provision (Code Sec. 1748). Of the larger cities, only Selma has the mayor-council plan. In cities over 6,000 the mayor does not sit with the council or vote unless the council has provided by resolution or ordinance that it consist of five aldermen elected at large, in which case the mayor votes and is presiding officer. In cities under 6,000 the mayor presides and votes in the council. The mayor has veto power with two-thirds vote needed to override.

*Commission:* A 1931 law makes the commission plan mandatory in cities of 40,000 to 67,000 (applying only to Montgomery), providing for three commissioners with four-year terms. Another act of 1931 (No. 102) makes it mandatory for cities from 24,000 to 40,000. Cities of 1,000 to 40,000 may adopt the plan with three commissioners with three-year terms. A 1911 law makes the plan mandatory in all the cities of 100,000 population and over (applying only to Birmingham) and another 1911 act (Act No. 281) provides that any other cities not otherwise provided for may adopt the commission plan. One law in 1927 and four in 1931 provide the commission plan for given cities. Under the optional plan a petition of 3 per cent of the population and a majority vote are required for adoption. The president of the board, who acts as mayor, is elected by the board.

*Council-Manager:* Cities with a 1920 population of 10,500 to 15,000 may adopt by referendum the manager plan (1927, No. 546). This act applies only to Florence, Gadsden, and Tuscaloosa. The mayor is elected by the people.—W. B. Holloway, University of Alabama.

## ARIZONA

*Classification:* Towns of over 3,000 may vote a common council and thus become a city. No maximum population for towns. (Code Sec. 386 as revised March, 1929.) Any city with 3,500 population or more may frame and adopt by majority vote a charter providing for any form of government, upon petition of 25 per cent of votes cast at last election. If adopted, the charter is submitted to the governor who must certify that it is not in conflict with the state constitution and laws. (Constitution, Art. 13; Code, Chap. 12, Art. 3.) Only three out of fourteen cities of over 3,500 have adopted charters in this manner.

*Mayor-Council:* Cities and towns over 500 may adopt this plan, upon petition of two-thirds of taxable inhabitants (Code Sec. 367). May be adopted also by home rule charter or by special charter. Under the optional mayor-council act the mayor is a member of the council chosen from its own members; in other cities he is elected. The mayor has no veto power.

*Commission and Council-Manager:* Any city over 3,500 may frame and adopt a council-manager or commission charter.—N. D. Houghton, University of Arizona.

## ARKANSAS

*Classification:* Cities—first class, over 5,000; second class, 1,750 to 5,000; all places under 1,750 are incorporated towns.

*Mayor-Council:* Any city or town, except as noted under council-manager and commission plans below, may adopt the mayor-council plan. In first class cities the mayor is the presiding officer, voting only in case of a tie. He may veto in whole or in part, with two-thirds vote needed to override. In second class cities the mayor is a member of the council, and in towns he acts as a member of the council and also presiding officer.

*Commission:* Any city between 18,000 and 40,000 may adopt by referendum this plan which provides for a mayor and two commissioners, serving four year terms. The mayor is elected by the people. (Kirby and Castle Code, 1916, Sec. 6765ff.)

*Council-Manager:* Cities between 2,500 and 50,000 may adopt by referendum provisions of the optional manager law which provides that 25 per cent of electors in last election for mayor must sign petition (Acts 1921 No. 99 as amended 1931). There are seven directors elected for four year terms; no mayor. No provision for abandoning plan. Cities between 8,100 and 9,000 may adopt by referendum provisions of an optional act which provides for a mayor and four commissioners serving four year terms (Acts 1929 No. 297). Plan may be abandoned after four years. Cities between 2,500 and 3,000 may adopt the provisions of an optional manager act which provides for a mayor and three commissioners, with no provision for abandoning the plan (Acts 1921 No. 604). Cities of over 50,000 may frame and adopt a home rule manager charter (Acts 1931 No. 311). The manager plan is provided by an Act of 1917 for cities between 12,000 and 15,000, after a referendum. This act provides for a mayor and four commissioners, with four year terms (Acts 1917, No. 114). Only one city has ever operated under the manager laws.—Kenneth O. Warner, University of Arkansas.

## CALIFORNIA

*Classification:* In California there are two general classes of cities—those existing by virtue of special charters drafted and adopted by the people of the community and ratified and approved by the legislature, and those incorporated under the provisions of the General Municipal Corporations Act. This latter act, which was adopted in 1883, was designed to provide uniform charters for cities classified according to population. The act provided for six classes of cities. At the present time, however, there are no cities incorporated and acting under any of the classifications with the exception of the fifth and sixth classes. In view of this fact the laws concerning the other classes have remained in the form in which they were originally enacted, and only the provisions of the law respecting the fifth and sixth classes have been amended from time to time and modernized.

Generally speaking, there are therefore only chartered cities, of which there are forty-four, cities of the fifth class of which there are three, and cities of the sixth class of which there are 232. It is interesting to note that the cities now being governed under the sixth class city law vary in population from 100 or 200 to approximately 20,000.

There is a General Classification Act in addition to the Municipal Corporations Act classifying cities into various classes in accordance with population. This act classifies cities merely for purposes of special legislation. The mayor-council plan is mandatory on all cities incorporated under the Municipal Corporations Act unless by election the people approve a commission or manager form. In cities formed by special charter any form of government may be adopted in the charter. In fifth and sixth class cities the mayor is merely the president of the city council and is elected by the council.—Richard Graves, League of California Municipalities, and John M. Pfiffner, University of Southern California.

## COLORADO

*Classification:* Cities—first class, over 15,000; second class, 2,000 to 15,000. Incorporated towns, under 2,000 population. Cities of over 2,000 population may adopt home rule charters providing for any form of government. A petition of 5 per cent of voters for governor is required if charter is submitted at a general election and 10 per cent if at a special referendum (Const. Art. 20, Secs. 5, 6). A charter convention must then be called by ordinance which drafts a charter to be submitted to the voters.

*Mayor-Council:* This plan is mandatory for cities not adopting home rule charters, and for all towns. In cities of the first class the mayor presides and votes in case of tie, except on ordinances involving expenditures. He may veto; three-fourths vote needed to override. In cities of the second class the mayor presides, votes on appointment of officers, otherwise casts vote only in case of tie. He may veto with two-thirds vote needed to override.

*Commission and Council-Manager:* Any city over 2,000 may adopt either plan under home rule. Five cities operate under the manager plan and three (Fort Collins, Pueblo, and Delta) under the commission plan. Denver has the strong mayor plan.—D. C. SOWERS, Colorado Municipal League.

## CONNECTICUT

*Classification:* Towns and boroughs are incorporated by action of the legislature, either by general statute or special charter. Cities must operate under special charter as municipalities are not classified and there are no general city laws. Twenty-one cities and twenty-three boroughs have been incorporated by special charters. There are also 169 towns; cities and boroughs are always situated within towns. Unless there are special provisions to the contrary, towns operate under the town-meeting plan with the first selectman as the chief officer. The mayor is the chief officer of the city and the warden of the borough. Connecticut had a form of legislative home rule which was repealed in 1929. The prevailing practice is for the legislature to draft a city charter as a special act. These acts usually become effective after a local referendum.

*Mayor-Council:* The city departments in cities with this form are usually managed by boards appointed by the mayor. The mayor generally votes only in case of tie. He has veto power which may be overridden usually by a simple majority vote.

*Council-Manager:* Towns may adopt the town manager plan under permissive general statutes by an affirmative vote in town meeting. New London has a manager by special charter and Stratford under the permissive act.—ROLLIN B. POSEY, director of research, city of Hartford.

## DELAWARE

Urban places are not classified and there are no general laws for municipalities. Each of the approximately 50 incorporated cities and towns has received a charter by special act of the legislature. Practically all of these charters have been amended but the original charters and amendments have never been codified. There are five cities in the state, namely, Delaware City, Dover, Milford, New Castle, and Wilmington. Only Wilmington (106,597) has a population over 5,000. In addition there are ten towns between 1,000 and 5,000; all other places have less than 1,000.—RUSSELL RAMSEY, Taxpayers' Research League of Delaware.

## FLORIDA

*Classification:* Cities—over 300 registered voters. Towns: less than 300 registered voters. Cities are not classified but a constitutional amendment adopted in 1934 enables the legislature to provide a uniform system of city and county government. The state municipal league, in order to permit proper study, has requested the 1935 legislature not to adopt any system for two years. Charters now in effect providing for various forms of government in most cases have been secured by special legislative action, with or without local referendum. Of the 110 cities of over 1,000 population, 3 are over 100,000, 11 between 10,000 and 50,000, 44 between 2,500 and 10,000, and 52 from 1,000 to 2,500.

*Mayor-Council:* Since each charter is secured by a legislative act, the method of electing the mayor, and his powers, vary from city to city. He may be elected by the people directly, by the council from its own members, chosen annually by the people from the ranks of hold-over commissioners, or be the commissioner receiving the highest number of votes.

*Commission and Council-Manager:* There are no general or home rule provisions; but 35 cities have secured the manager plan through a special legislative charter and a number of other cities have secured the commission plan in the same manner.—C. T. Parsons, *Florida Municipal Record.*

## GEORGIA

Cities are not classified. There is a general law providing for government of towns and villages (synonymous terms). Towns with 25 voters may incorporate by applying to the superior court. Cities, as well as towns, may be chartered by special act of the legislature and without local referendum, although in a number of instances, such as in Albany and Columbus, the act required a local referendum for adoption. (Ga. Code 1933, Title 69.) Special legislative charters may of course provide for any form of government. The repeal or amendment of charters in cities of less than 50,000 requires a local referendum. (1930 Supplement to Georgia Code, Seventh Title, Chapter 11.) There are fifteen council-manager cities but the usual form is the mayor-council; the mayor customarily has a veto but may vote only in case of tie. (Sec. 913 [19] Ga. Laws 1925, p. 136; Georgia Laws 1927, p. 245.)—Cullen B. Gosnell, Emory University.

## IDAHO

*Classification:* Cities—first class, over 15,000; second class, from 1,000 to 15,000. However, second class cities may adopt village government. Villages are from 200 to 1,000.

*Mayor-Council:* This form is mandatory for first class cities unless they adopt the commission or manager form. Villages over 1,000 may adopt city government upon petition signed by three-fifths of voters at last election. (Idaho Code, 1932 Sec. 49-306.) The mayor is not a member of the council and votes only in case of tie. He has veto power which may be overridden by two-thirds vote.

*Commission:* Any city over 2,500 may adopt the provisions of the optional commission plan law by referendum after a petition signed by 25 per cent of voters at last election (1932 Code, Sec. 49-3002), or by special charter locally prepared and adopted. The mayor is elected.

*Council-Manager:* Any city over 2,500 may adopt the provisions of the optional council-manager act by referendum as in commission form (Code 49-3701). The modified council-manager law of 1919, however, does not provide for the adoption of all of the essential features of the recognized manager plan. Chairman of commission chosen by commissioners.—J. D. Wood, Idaho State Planning Board.

## ILLINOIS

*Classification:* Cities—Communities of over 1,000 may be organized as cities; any community over 100 may be organized as a village. Towns were incorporated under a special legislative act before 1870 but the constitution of 1870 forbids such incorporation. Cities, villages, and towns are not classed according to size. There are now 278 cities, 815 villages, and 31 towns. Some of the large municipalities of the state still operate under the village form, the largest being Oak Park (63,982).

*Mayor-Council:* Any community organized as a city may adopt the provisions of the optional mayor-council act. Of the 278 cities, 210 now have the mayor-council plan. The mayor presides at council meetings and votes only in case of tie. He may veto ordinances and a two-thirds vote is necessary to override. He has a two-year term of office. Communities organized as villages may adopt by local referendum a plan providing for a president and board of trustees with the same powers as mayor and council in cities. The thirty-one towns incorporated under special charter prior to 1870 generally have a president and board of trustees. (Ann. Stats. 1934, Chapter 24, Secs. 15ff.)

*Commission:* All cities and villages with less than 200,000 may adopt the optional law which provides for a mayor and four commissioners. Sixty-eight cities have adopted this plan by local referendum, after petition of one-tenth of voters at last election (Ch. 24, Sec. 266). The mayor is elected.

*Council-Manager:* This plan may be adopted by any city or village under 5,000, by adopting the provisions of council-manager enabling act providing for mayor (elected) and four commissioners. No cities have adopted the provisions of this act (Ch. 24, Secs. 340ff.), all six council-manager municipalities are villages which have adopted the plan by ordinance. Until there is a court decision to the contrary, any city, town, or village, irrespective of size, except commission form cities, may adopt the manager plan by ordinance.—A. D. McLarty, Illinois Municipal League.

## INDIANA

*Classification:* Cities—all places of 3,000 and over. Classes: first, 250,000 or over; second, 35,000 to 250,000; third, 20,000 to 35,000; fourth, 10,000 to 20,000; and fifth, 3,000 to 10,000. Towns: under 3,000. There are 94 cities and over 400 towns. Prior to 1933, all incorporated places of 2,500 and over were classed as cities. The new classification statute of that year, however, provides that cities of less than 3,000 should revert on January 1, 1934, to the status of incorporated towns, to be governed, like other towns, by a board of town trustees instead of mayor and council. This provision, according to the populations reported in the 1930 census, would have applied to nineteen of the state's 102 cities. As a matter of fact, however, only eight of these cities actually held town elections in 1933 and reverted to the town status. A law passed in 1933, effective at the November 1934 elections, makes it mandatory for all cities to elect councilmen at large instead of by wards, but with nomination by districts.

*Mayor-Council:* Mandatory for all cities. In first and second class cities the council selects the presiding officer from its own members, the mayor being elected as such and having no vote in the council. In third, fourth, and fifth class cities the mayor is the presiding officer and votes only in case of tie. Mayor has veto in all cities, with two-thirds vote needed to override. Municipalities with less than 3,000 population are officially designated as towns and are governed by boards of town trustees.

*Commission:* No provision; optional commission law of 1921 held invalid because of defects in procedural provisions.

*Council-Manager:* No provision; optional law of 1921 declared invalid because of defects in procedural provisions (*Keane v. Remy,* 201 Indiana 286, 168 N. E. 10).—Clyde F. Snider, University of Indiana.

## IOWA

*Classification:* Cities—first class, over 15,000; second class, 2,000 to 15,000. Towns: Under 2,000. Town sites platted but not incorporated are known as villages. There are 16 cities of the first class and 95 of the second class. Two cities and two towns operate under special charters granted before 1858 (Code of 1931, Chap. 328).

*Mayor-Council:* Established by general law and in a few instances special charters. Mayor is the presiding officer, voting only in case of tie. May veto with two-thirds vote needed to override (Code of 1931, Chap. 287).

*Commission:* Upon petition of 25 per cent of voters and a special election, any city may adopt the provisions of the optional state law providing, in cities of over 25,000, for a mayor and four commissioners serving two years; and in cities of 2,000 to 25,000 a mayor and two commissioners. Commissioners are elected for specific departments and the mayor is elected. The plan may be abandoned after six years. Seven cities have the commission plan (Code of 1931, Chap. 326).

*Council-Manager:* Any city or incorporated town may adopt the provisions of the optional council-manager law by referendum after petition of 25 per cent of voters (Code of 1927, Chap. 328). In the latter case, the plan may be abandoned after six years. Cities under 25,000 not having the commission plan may adopt manager plan by ordinance (Code of 1927, Chap. 327). Nineteen cities have the manager plan. The mayor is chosen by the council from its members.—J. A. Swisher, State Historical Society of Iowa.

## KANSAS

*Classification:* Cities—first class, over 15,000; second class, 2,000 to 15,000; and third class, less than 2,000. Communities may incorporate as cities of the third class when they have reached a population of not less than 100 or more than 2,000. On incorporation cities automatically adopt mayor-council government but may afterwards adopt either manager or commission plan under the optional laws.

*Mayor-Council:* The mayor is the presiding officer, voting only in case of a tie. He has power to veto all ordinances. Ordinances may be passed over his veto by a three-fourths vote in first class cities and a two-thirds vote in other cities. In first class cities he may veto items in appropriation ordinances.

*Commission:* Any city may adopt the commission plan by referendum (Rev. Stat. 1923 and Supp. 1933, 13-1501, 14-1101, 15-1201). The mayor is elected under this plan. The plan may be abandoned after four years trial in first and second class cities; there is no provision for abandonment in third class cities.

*Council-Manager:* The plan provided by general statutes may be adopted upon referendum by any commission city. (Sec. 12-1001, 12-1018.) Mayor-council cities of the second and third classes upon majority vote at local referendum, may provide by ordinance for the appointment of a city manager, retaining the other essentials of the mayor-council plan (House Bill No. 67, 1935 enacted into law in February, 1935). In cities with commissions the mayor is one of the commissioners designated by the commission. The council-manager plan may be abandoned after four years, but second and third class mayor-council cities which adopt the plan under the new law may abandon it at any succeeding general municipal election.—Albert B. Martin, League of Kansas Municipalities.

## KENTUCKY

*Classification:* Cities—first class, over 100,000; second class, 20,000 to 100,000; third class, 8,000 to 20,000; fourth class, 3,000 to 8,000; fifth class, 1,000 to 3,000; and sixth class, under 1,000. Communities must have 125 inhabitants or more before they can be incorporated (Ky. Stat. 3713). There are one first class city, five second class, eight third class, forty-nine fourth class, sixty-nine fifth class, and 129 sixth class cities (not including incorporated places without active governments). No city or town can be transferred from one class to another except by legislative action (Ky. Const., Sec. 156), and because of this a number of cities and towns are not classified strictly in accordance with population specifications (Ky. Stats. 2740-41).

*Mayor-Council:* The mayor-council form is mandatory for cities of every class except for the commission and manager options mentioned below (Chapter 89, Ky. Stats.). The mayor is not a member of the council in first and second class cities. In third, fourth, and fifth class cities he is the presiding officer and votes only in case of tie. In fourth class cities he may vote to make a quorum. The mayor has veto power in cities of the first to fourth classes inclusive, with two-thirds vote necessary to override. A single first class city, three of the third, forty-five of the fourth class, and all of the fifth class operate under the mayor-council plan.

All of the 129 cities of the sixth class operate under a plan providing for a board of trustees and a chairman elected by the board from its own membership. The chairman has no veto power.

*Commission:* Any city except one of the first class may adopt this plan by referendum (Ky. Stats. 3235c, 3480b, 3606b, 2741f). The mayor is elected as such by the people except in the fifth and sixth classes where the commissioners select a mayor from their own number (Ky. Stat. 2741f-5).

*Council-Manager:* Any city of the second and fourth class may adopt the provisions of the optional council-manager laws (Ky. Stats. 3235dd; 3606c). The mayor is elected by the people.—Roy H. Owsley, Kentucky Municipal League.

## LOUISIANA

*Classification:* Cities—5,000 population or more. Towns: 1,000 to 5,000. Villages: 150 to 1,000.

*Mayor-Council:* The aldermanic plan is found in all cities except New Orleans and those over 7,500 which elect to adopt the commission or manager plan. The mayor is elected, presides at all meetings, casts vote in case of tie, and has veto power. The general act providing the mayor-council plan is adopted by referendum after petition of 25 freeholders (Dart, Gen. Statutes 1932, Sec. 5447).

*Commission:* Any city over 7,500 except New Orleans may adopt this plan upon petition of 25 per cent of voters and a special election. There is an inconsistency in that any city of 5,000 to 25,000 may have a mayor and two commissioners. The commission plan may be abandoned after six years. The commission plan is the prevailing form. (Gen. Statutes, Sec. 5452-5505.)

*Council-Manager:* Any city over 5,000 except New Orleans may adopt by referendum the provisions of an optional act providing for five commissioners serving four years. Manager can be recalled by vote of people. No provision for abandoning plan. Practically impossible to adopt manager plan because to get proposal on ballot a 33 1/3 per cent petition of all votes cast for mayor at last election is necessary. (Gen. Statutes, Sec. 5506-5669.)

Five cities operate under special charters: Baton Rouge, Lake Charles, Monroe, and Shreveport have the mayor-council plan, and New Orleans the commission form.—Harold A. Stone, New Orleans Bureau of Governmental Research.

## MAINE

*Classification:* Cities are not classified according to population. Charters are granted by special act of the legislature, but are generally submitted to local referendum before being put into effect. Twenty cities have obtained charters in this manner. Seven of these cities have council-manager charters. Nine cities have a mayor and single chamber council, or board of aldermen. Four cities, Augusta, Bath, Biddeford, and Waterville, have a mayor and a bicameral council.

*Mayor-Council:* Provisions with regard to the power of the mayor vary considerably. Augusta, although having a bicameral council, puts the power of appointment in the hands of the mayor. In general in all of the remaining cities the appointing power is shared jointly by the mayor and the council. In all of the cities, with the exception of those having the council-manager plan, the mayor has the veto power.

*Town Meeting:* All other municipalities operate under the town meeting-selectmen plan. If any change from the regular town form is desired, the town petitions the legislature for a special act which is usually passed with provision for approval by a local referendum.

*Council-Manager:* Municipalities desiring to adopt this plan must secure from the legislature a special charter which is usually submitted to local referendum. Thirteen municipalities have established the plan by charter and at least two towns have adopted it by ordinance.—Orren C. Hormell, Bowdoin College.

## MARYLAND

Cities are not classified and there is no legislation providing optional forms. There is no distinction between towns and cities and no requirement as to population for securing corporation. The legislature grants a special charter for each town that is incorporated except Baltimore which has complete home rule. Many of the smaller towns have a president and town commissioners, and a few have a mayor and council. Only two cities, Cumberland and Frostburg, have the commission plan; there are no council-manager cities.—Horace E. Flack, Department of Legislative Reference, Baltimore.

## MASSACHUSETTS

*Classification:* Cities are not classified. There are only cities and towns. Towns of 12,000 or over may become cities by vote of the inhabitants and action of the legislature. All the plans outlined below may be adopted by referendum except in Boston.

*Mayor-Council:* Plan A (Tercentenary Edition of General Laws, 1932, Chap. 43, secs. 46-55) provides for strong mayor-council type of government. The mayor is not a member of the council. He has veto power, which requires a two-thirds vote to override. The mayor appoints and removes without confirmation of action by the city council. The council is elected at large for two years annually (5 one year, 4 the succeeding year, or biennially as a group). The council numbers 9. Plan B (Chap. 43, secs. 56-63) provides for a weak-mayor type. The mayor is not a member of the council. He has veto power which requires a two-thirds vote to override. With the exception of the city solicitor all appointments and removals must be confirmed by a majority of the council. In cities with seven or more wards the council numbers 15, elected for two years, one from each ward and the remainder at large. If less than seven wards, the council numbers 11, and is elected in the same manner.

*Commission:* Under Plan C (Chap. 43, secs. 64-78) the commission consists of five members elected for two year terms. The mayor, elected for two years, is a member of the commission and designated as commissioner of administration. The four other members of the commission are elected for two year overlapping terms.

*Council-Manager:* Plan D (Chap. 43, secs. 79-92) follows a standard form for council-manager government. The council is to be composed of a mayor and four other members elected at large annually or biennially. The mayor sits and votes with the council but has no veto power. The city council appoints the city manager for an indeterminate term. The city manager appoints and removes all officers, making a report to the city council thereon. Towns may secure special town manager charters from the legislature (Cf. charter for Braintree Acts of 1934, Chap. 324 defeated by voters in March, 1935).

The forms adopted under the optional charter law above, first passed in 1915 (Chap. 267), may be abandoned by referendum after four years.

*Town meeting.* (Chap. 43A and 314, Acts and Resolves, 1931.) Any town may adopt by referendum the so-called representative town meeting plan which provides for a town meeting of as nearly as possible 240 elected members, elected from precincts which must include at least 400 voters each and defined by the selectmen. The members of the representative town meeting alone have the right to vote on measures, although there is a referendum provision on all appropriations over $20,000 voted by the meeting. The structure of town government is not affected; the usual officers, selectmen, etc. remain. Eighteen towns have adopted the representative plan, either by special act or under the General Act of 1931. Other towns in Massachusetts retain the traditional town meeting plan under general law or special act creating the municipality.

Towns by referendum may adopt city form of government under special act of the legislature, when they reach a minimum of 12,000 population. Many larger communities still retain the town meeting form of government.—PHILLIPS BRADLEY, Amherst College.

## MICHIGAN

*Classification:* There are no cities specifically termed by law as first, second, or third class—these classes have been superseded by home rule provisions. Fourth class cities are those with 3,000 to 10,000; the fifth class is composed of villages of 750 to 2,000 which may incorporate as cities. Villages are communities of not less than 250 people. Any city or village may adopt any form of government by charter, drawn up by elective charter commission and submitted to election (Compiled Laws, 1929, Chaps. 47-49). Each city charter must provide for election of a mayor but the charter may provide that he is elected by legislative body. The governor must approve all charters and all amendments to city charters. In practice this approval is secured without difficulty. Amendments by initiative petition go before the voters in spite of governor's veto. Amendments proposed by city council and vetoed by the governor may be submitted by a two-thirds vote of members-elect of the council.

*Mayor-Council:* May be adopted by fourth class cities, under fourth class optional act (Chap. 48), by petition of freeholders and referendum under general village act (Chap. 47), or under any home rule city or village charter. The mayor under fourth class cities law is the presiding officer and casts vote only in case of tie; he has veto power with two-thirds vote needed to override. The majority of smaller cities not under home rule operate under the fourth class cities law.

*Commission and Council-Manager:* Any city or village may adopt and frame its own charter providing for either form of government. Villages not adopting home rule charters operate under the general village act which provides for a president and board of trustees resembling the mayor-council plan. Any such village may adopt a home rule amendment to the general village act.—A. W. Bromage, University of Michigan.

## MINNESOTA

*Classification:* Cities: first class, over 50,000; second class, 20,000 to 50,000; third class, 10,000 to 20,000; and fourth class, not to exceed 10,000. Any platted territory of not more than 3,000 or less than 100 may become incorporated village (villages do not automatically become cities). Only one borough remains, Belle Plaine, incorporated in the early days by the legislature; all other boroughs so created have been abandoned or reincorporated as villages or cities.

*Forms of Government:* Any city can frame and adopt its own charter providing for any form of government that is constitutional under home rule provisions. Charter is framed by board of freeholders appointed by judges of judicial district in which city is located and is submitted to voters at election; four-sevenths vote needed to adopt. (Mason's Statutes, 1927, Sec. 1268-1300.) Powers and duties may be assigned to any official, the mayor may or may not be a member of the council, and may or may not have veto power. Cities of fourth class may incorporate under general statutes with mayor-council government (Chap. 462 Minnesota Statutes, 1921). Seventy-one cities have adopted home rule charters—57 provide for mayor-council plan, 9 for commission plan, and 5 for council-manager plan. There are 637 incorporated villages operating in general under president, clerk or recorder, and three trustees, who constitute the council.—Ambrose Fuller, League of Minnesota Municipalities.

## MISSOURI

*Classification:* Cities—first class, cities over 100,000 (except St. Louis and Kansas City), but cities from 75,000 to 150,000 may elect to become first class; second class, 30,000 to 100,000, but cities of 27,500 to 75,000 may elect to become second class; third class, 3,000 to 30,000; fourth class, 500 to 3,000, but villages and towns created by special law may become fourth class cities even though the population may be under 500. Villages over 200 may elect to become fourth class cities. Cities and towns that originally received special charters may retain them, although the legislature may no longer grant such special charters.

Only one city is first class (St. Joseph); two are second class. There are 58 cities eligible to come under the third class city law. While the majority of these have accepted third class city status, a number retain their special charters, and a few continue operating under the fourth class law. The state constitution has two provisions on home rule; one applies specifically to St. Louis, and the other to cities of over 100,000 (Kansas City). No home rule for other cities. Legislature has also enacted special legislation for groups of cities classified on some basis other than above classes. Change of population does not require change of plan, although cities may elect to change.

*Mayor-Council:* Mandatory for first class cities (St. Joseph only); optional for third class cities; and mandatory for fourth class cities. Cities retaining their special charters and a majority of those accepting third class city law operate under the mayor-council plan. Under the third class city law this is the weak mayor-council plan, with the council elected by wards, and the attorney, treasurer, collector, assessor, police chief, and police judge, elected by the people. In first class cities, the mayor is not a member of council. In third and fourth class cities the mayor is the presiding officer and votes only in case of tie. The mayor may veto. In first class cities a four-fifths vote; in third and fourth classes a two-thirds vote is needed to override.

*Commission:* Second and third class cities may adopt provisions of optional act. Both second class cities and about ten of the third class cities have adopted the commission plan. In second class cities, the commission plan was mandatory until 1933, at which time the council-manager form was established as an alternative plan. The second class cities have a mayor and four commissioners elected for four years, commissioners being chosen for specific departments. In third class cities the mayor is elected and the number of commissioners varies according to the size of the city, the commissioners serving two-year terms. The plan is adopted by referendum. The petition calling the election must be signed by at least 25 per cent of the number voting in last city election.

*Council-Manager:* Any second or third class city may adopt by referendum the provisions of the optional council-manager acts. Of the cities in these two classes, only two have accepted the council-manager form as provided by the legislative enactments. The mayor is chosen by the council from its number.

Citations: Revised Statutes of Missouri, 1929, sections 6114, 6719-40, 6946-60, 6480-6540, 6906-29, 6930-45. Laws 1933, p. 284ff.—MARTIN L. FAUST, University of Missouri.

## MISSISSIPPI

*Classification:* Cities are places of more than 2,000; towns, 300 to 2,000; villages 100 to 300. Cities and towns are incorporated under general laws (Const. Sec. 88) but a number of special charters exist.

*Mayor-Council:* The statutes provide a mayor-council government for all municipalities. It may be adopted by a petition of one-fourth of the voters and a referendum. The mayor is presiding officer with a casting vote and a veto which may be overridden by a two-thirds vote of the council. (Sec. 2513, Code of 1930.)

*Commission:* Any city over 2,000 may adopt this plan by referendum. Ten per cent of the voters must sign the petition. The mayor and two councilmen are elected. (Sec. 2626-2627.)

*Council-Manager:* There are no specific provisions for this plan.

## MONTANA

*Classification:* Cities—first class, over 10,000; second class, 5,000 to 10,000; and third class, 1,000 to 5,000. Towns: 300 to 1,000. There are eighteen cities of over 2,500 and twenty-four between 1,000 and 2,500.

*Mayor-Council:* Established by general law in cities not adopting commission or manager plan; mandatory for towns. Mayor is presiding officer, casts vote only in case of tie, and may veto with two-thirds vote to override.

*Commission:* Any city may adopt the provisions of optional commission statute at local referendum after petition signed by 25 per cent of electors. May abandon after one year. In cities under 25,000 a mayor and two councilmen are elected for two years; in cities over 25,000, a mayor and four councilmen for two years. (Choate, Revised Codes of 1921, Chap. 63.)

*Council-Manager:* Any city may adopt the provisions of the optional act by local referendum as in commission form. In cities under 25,000 there are three commissioners; in cities over 25,000, five commissioners, with terms in both cases of four years. The commissioner receiving highest number of votes is mayor. May be abandoned after two years. (Rev. Codes, Chap. 64.) The 1935 legislature is considering a bill that would enable cities and counties to consolidate and frame and adopt their own charters.—Fred Bennion, Montana Taxpayers' Association.

## NEBRASKA

*Classification:* Cities: metropolitan plan, over 100,000; first class, 5,000 to 100,000; second class, 1,000 to 5,000. Villages: 100 to 1,000, including second class cities that have adopted village government. Home rule: Any city over 5,000 may frame and adopt its own charter. Three cities, Omaha, Lincoln, and Grand Island, now operate under home rule charters, but in all three cases they are the old legislative charters adopted by local vote on recommendation of local charter commission. Charter is framed by charter convention called by petition of 10 per cent of electors and is submitted by referendum. (Compiled Statutes, 1929, Sec. 19-501.)

*Mayor-Council:* Mandatory for all cities not adopting commission or council-manager plan. In cities over 100,000, mayor is a member of the council, elected by council, and has no veto. In cities of 40,000 to 100,000 the mayor is not a member but may veto. In cities of 1,000 to 25,000 he is presiding officer, and votes only in case of tie. (Sec. 14-217, 15-405, 16-308, 17-110.)

*Commission:* Cities over 2,000 may adopt provisions of optional act by local referendum. Mayor is a member of council chosen by council. Number of commissioners varies: seven in cities over 100,000; five in cities of 25,000 to 100,000; and three in cities of 2,000 to 25,000. Cities may abandon plan after four years. (Sec. 19-401 to 19-402, 19-404.)

*Council-Manager:* Cities of 1,000 to 100,000 may adopt provisions of optional act by local referendum. Mayor is chosen as before the adoption of the plan. Cities under 25,000 have five councilmen serving four years; over 40,000 have seven councilmen serving four years. (Sec. 19-601 to 19-610.) Cities may abandon plan after four years. —Lane W. Lancaster, University of Nebraska.

## NEVADA

*Classification:* Cities—first class, over 20,000; second class, 5,000 to 20,000; third class, all others—must have 250 voters to incorporate. Mayor-council is the prevailing form.

*Mayor-Council:* All cities have this plan. The mayor is presiding officer and has a casting vote only in case of a tie. (Sec. 1117.) He may veto; the vote needed to override is, in first class cities, seven-ninths; in second class cities, four-fifths; and in third class cities, by unanimous vote.

*Commission:* Any city or town may draft and adopt a charter under a statutory provision. Petition of one-fifth of voters at last election, followed by referendum. (Sec. 1248-56 N. C. L. 1929.)

*Council-Manager:* No specific provision, but right of home rule and self-government is granted to all cities and towns incorporated under municipal law (Sec. 1100

N. C. L. 1929). A mandamus suit is now pending before the state supreme court involving the permissibility of the council-manager form under the initiative of the constitution, Art. 19, Sec. 3. Another possible statutory basis for the adoption of the manager plan is provided in a section which grants considerable freedom in amending city charters (Sec. 1257 N. C. L. 1929).—C. R. PUGH, attorney, Reno.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

*Classification:* No classification of cities is provided in the law. Cities, towns, and villages are incorporated as such.

*Mayor-Council:* Cities are established by legislative act. All nine cities have mayor-council government at present. Mayor is presiding officer with power to vote. He has a veto which may be overridden by two-thirds vote.

*Commission:* There is no provision for this plan.

*Council-Manager:* Any town or city may adopt the provisions of the optional council-manager law applying to towns and cities (Chapters 69 and 186, Laws of 1929). There are none in state at present. Mayor would be elected as formerly.

*Town Meeting:* The town meeting plan with selectmen is in effect in all cities and towns except the nine cities operating under the mayor-council plan. Any town may adopt the provisions of the town meeting law by a majority vote at local referendum.—MILTON V. SMITH, Dartmouth College.

## NEW JERSEY

*Classification:* Cities—first class, over 150,000; second class, 12,000 to 150,000; third class, all cities not in first and second classes except seaside or summer resorts bordering on Atlantic Ocean; fourth class, cities bordering on Atlantic Ocean and being seaside or summer resorts. Boroughs: First class, over 3,000; second class, 1,500 to 3,000; third class, all others. There are 62 cities, 23 towns, 254 boroughs, 235 townships, and one village.

*Mayor-Council:* Prevailing form, with many variations. At least twelve general acts with provisions for city charters are in force at present. Cities may have mayor-council also under special charter. In general the mayor is not a member of the council, and has a veto which may be overridden by a two-thirds vote. Most of the towns operate under a modified mayor-council plan. Townships operate under a township committee plan and villages under a board of trustees which resembles the mayor-council plan.

*Commission:* Any city may adopt the provisions of optional commission act by local referendum. Sixty-one cities and boroughs have done so. Mayor is chosen by commission from own members. Twenty per cent of voters at last election must sign petition. (Cumulative Sup. 1911-24, Sec.* *136.)

*Council-Manager:* Any municipality may adopt by referendum following petition of 15 per cent of voters in last election. Mayor is chosen by council from councilmen. (Cumulative Sup. 1911-24, Sec. * * * 136.)—HENRY REINING, JR., Princeton University.

## NEW MEXICO

*Classification:* Cities—over 3,000. Towns: 1,500 to 3,000. Villages: 150 to 1,500. Any city may frame and adopt by referendum a charter providing any form of government not inconsistent with state constitution. Petition must be signed by number of electors equal to 15 per cent of votes cast at last election. (Statutes, 1929, Sec. 90-3001 to 90-3004.)

*Mayor-Council:* Provided by general statutes for cities not adopting some other form. Mayor is elected and is presiding officer of council with casting vote only in case of tie. He has a veto; two-thirds vote needed to override.

*Commission:* Any city may draft and adopt charter providing for commission plan.

*Council-Manager:* Any city between 3,000 and 10,000 may adopt by referendum provisions of optional council-manager law providing for three commissioners elected at large but nominated by districts. Plan may also be adopted by charter. Commissioners elect one of their number as mayor (Statutes, 90-3901 to 90-3909).—RUPERT F. ASPLUND, Taxpayers' Association of New Mexico.

## NEW YORK

*Classification:* Cities are not classified; they are incorporated as such by act of the legislature. Villages: first class, over 5,000 population; second class, 3,000 to 5,000; third class, 1,000 to 3,000; and fourth class, under 1,000. This classification was set up in the general village law for all except 27 villages which were incorporated by special act of the legislature prior to the adoption of an amendment to the state constitution prohibiting the legislature from incorporating villages by special act. There is also provision for certain special classes of towns in certain counties. Any city may adopt any form of government under the Home Rule Law of 1923. Changes may be made by local legislative body but important changes must be approved by local referendum. (Cahill's Consolidated Laws, 1930, Chap. 6a.)

*Mayor-Council:* Any city may adopt by local referendum. In 37 of the 60 cities in the state the mayor is a member of council; in ten of the 37 votes only in case of tie. In 45 he has veto; the percentage needed to override varies.

*Commission:* Any city may adopt this form by local referendum as provided in Chapter 444, Laws of 1914, or under the Home Rule Act. Five cities now operate under this plan. Under the 1914 law the mayor is elected.

*Council-Manager:* Any city may adopt the council-manager plan by drafting and adopting its own charter at local referendum, or by voting to adopt the provisions of plan C of Chapter 444 of the Laws of 1914. Thirteen cities now operate under the manager plan. The mayor is elected.—E. D. GREENMAN, New York State Conference of Mayors.

## NORTH CAROLINA

*Classification:* Cities are incorporated by the legislature or under the municipal corporations act. There are still cities under special charters. (Sec. 2625.) The municipal corporations act provides four optional plans which any city may adopt by referendum. Within constitutional limitations any municipality may abandon its charter or adopt a new charter; proposal may be initiated by the local legislative body or by petition of 25 per cent of voters at last election. (Code of 1931, Sec. 2902.)

*Mayor-Council:* A strong mayor-council plan is provided in Plan A (Sec. 2860-61) under which a mayor and council are elected at large. Under Plan B the council is elected by districts and at large (Sec. 2868); mayor is not a member of council. Mayor has veto power. Plan A requires two-thirds vote to override mayor's veto (Sec. 2865). Under Plan B a majority vote is needed (Sec. 2872).

*Commission:* Plan C providing for a mayor elected as such with two other commissioners (Sec. 2873-2886) may be adopted by any city.

*Council-Manager:* Any city may adopt the provisions of Plan D providing for a council of five members elected for two years. Mayor chosen by the council from its own members. (Sec. 2887-2900.)—PATRICK HEALY, JR., North Carolina League of Municipalities.

## NORTH DAKOTA

*Classification:* Cities—incorporated villages and towns may incorporate as cities under general law.

*Mayor-Council:* Any municipality may adopt this form by incorporating under general statute. The mayor is not a member of the council but presides; has casting vote only. Has veto power, with two-thirds vote necessary to override veto. Villages are governed by a board of trustees.

*Commission:* Cities over 500 may adopt by petition signed by 10 per cent of voters and referendum. The elected president of the board is presiding officer; there are four commissioners elected for four years. Plan may be abandoned after six years. (Compiled Laws, 1913, Chap. 45.)

*Council-Manager:* Any city may adopt by petition signed by 25 per cent of voters at last election and election carried by four-sevenths vote. The mayor or president is elected. The appointment of auditor, health officer, attorney, and assessor must be confirmed by council. Cities may abandon after five years. (Laws of 1933, Chap. 1723.) —Myron H. Atkinson, League of North Dakota Municipalities.

## OHIO

*Classification:* Cities—over 5,000; villages, under 5,000. Home rule: The question of appointing a charter commission may be submitted to the local legislative body or at the petition of 10 per cent of the electors may be submitted to a vote of the people (Const. Art. XVIII, Sec. 7-9).

*Mayor-Council:* (Federal plan.) Cities may adopt one of three optional laws by referendum in same manner as proposition to frame charter. The mayor is a member of council without right to vote. He may veto, with two-thirds vote needed to override. The mayor is elected as such (Sec. 3515-1 Art. V).

*Commission:* Any city may draft and adopt its own charter, under home rule, providing for the commission plan. An alternative is to adopt the provisions of the general statutes which provide in cities of less than 10,000 for three commissioners, in cities of over 10,000, five commissioners, elected for four-year terms in both instances. There is no provision for the mayor. (Code of Ohio, 1929, Sec. 3515, 1 Art. 3.)

*Council-Manager:* Any city may draft and adopt a home rule charter providing for the manager plan, or adopt the provisions of the optional act which provides for five councilmen in cities of less than 10,000, seven councilmen in cities of 10,000 to 25,000, and nine councilmen in cities of over 25,000, all for four-year terms, with no provision being made for mayor. (Sec. 3515, 1 Art. IV.) The optional plan does not provide for the approved manager plan, as the council is given power to appoint and remove all officers and employees. As a result cities adopting the provisions of the optional act have had to pass ordinances conferring more adequate powers on the manager.—E. Allen Helms, Ohio State University.

## OKLAHOMA

*Classification:* Cities—communities over 2,000 may become cities. Towns are other incorporated communities. Cities are described as first class, but there are no other classes. Any city may frame and adopt its own charter at local referendum (Constitution, Art. XVIII, Sec. 3). Of these at present, 29 are council-manager and approximately 30 are commission. (Statutes, 1931, Chap. 33, Sec. 6424-33.)

*Mayor-Council:* Mandatory for cities not adopting home rule. The mayor is the presiding officer; has casting vote only; may veto ordinances; two-thirds vote needed to override. Towns are governed by a board of trustees.

*Commission and Council-Manager:* Any city may frame and adopt a charter providing for either form.—LYNDEN MANNEN, Oklahoma Municipal League.

## OREGON

Cities and towns with over 150 population may incorporate. There is no distinction in law between cities ond towns. Home rule: Any city may frame a charter; about seven have done so. Constitution, Article XI, Sec. 2 states that every city and town has a right to enact and amend a charter subject to state constitution and criminal laws.

*Mayor-Council:* This is the prevailing form in the state. Usually the mayor is a member of the council with a right to vote. Has the power to veto which may be overridden by a two-thirds vote. (Some charters designate the mayor as a member of the council for purpose of making a quorum.) There is a general law (Sec. 56-201ff.) for the mayor-council form under which cities may incorporate if they desire.

*Commission and Council-Manager:* Cities may draft and adopt charters under home rule provisions providing for either form.—HERMAN KEHRLI, League of Oregon Cities.

## PENNSYLVANIA

*Classification:* Cities—first class, population over 1,000,000 (Philadelphia only) moderate strong-mayor government; second class, 500,000 to 1,000,000 (Pittsburgh); second class A, 135,000 to 500,000 (Scranton only) strong-mayor type; third class, population under 135,000 (44 cities). No borough may become a city of the third class unless it has 10,000 population; this change must be made by vote of the people. There are many boroughs over 10,000 population which are not third class cities. There are also a few third class cities which are below 10,000 population, but they once were above that standard. There is a constitutional home rule provision but the legislature never passed an enabling act.

*Mayor-Council:* Mayor is not a member of council in first and second class cities but in third class cities he is a full-fledged commissioner. In boroughs (all municipal corporations not cities—935 in state) he is not a member of the council. He presides until the council is organized with a president. He does not preside at regular meetings. He casts a vote only in case of a tie and then he is not a presiding officer. The mayor in third class cities presides over council at all times. He votes as a full member at all times. In first and second class cities and in boroughs the mayor or burgess has the right of veto. In third class cities the mayor has no veto. In first class cities three-fifths vote and in second class two-thirds vote is needed to override.

*Commission:* Permitted only in third class cities. The mayor is elected as such. (1913, P. L. 932.)

*Council-Manager:* Permitted by ordinance of council only in boroughs (1927, P. L. 519). First class townships also may have plan by same token, but there is some question about the right of third class cities to adopt it. In two cases there were short-lived city managers appointed by commission by ordinance. Legislation allowing all municipalities to vote on adoption of manager form of government has been submitted in many sessions of the legislature.—H. F. ALDERFER, Pennsylvania State College.

## RHODE ISLAND

*Classification:* Cities and towns are incorporated by special acts. There is no classification. There are seven cities and 32 towns. No general laws for cities.

*Mayor-Council:* All cities have this form (five have bicameral councils). Some towns have the town meeting plan of choosing the town council; others elect town council by secret ballot. Town meeting with selectmen in all towns is the only other form. A general law is now pending (S. 137, 1935) to enable cities and towns to frame and adopt charters for their own government.—C. R. BERGHULT, Providence Governmental Research Bureau.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

*Classification:* Cities and towns are incorporated by acts of the general assembly. There is no population limit.

*Mayor-Council:* This plan is provided by general statute for cities and towns 1,000 to 5,000 (Secs. 7445-47 S. C. Code) and for cities over 5,000 (Sec. 7453 S. C. Code), except those adopting the manager or commission plan. The mayor is usually a member of the council with no provision for veto.

*Commission:* The mayor is elected as such under the commission form. This plan may be adopted in cities between 4,000 and 100,000 population (Secs. 7582 and 7657 S. C. Code).

*Council-Manager:* Cities 2,000 to 4,000 may adopt this plan by referendum. The mayor is elected. Cities may abandon the plan after six years (Sec. 7623 S. C. Code). Towns under 1,000 are governed by intendant and four wardens (Sec. 7402 S. C. Code).—GEORGE R. SHERRILL, Clemson Agricultural College.

## SOUTH DAKOTA

*Classification:* Cities—first class, over 5,000; second class, 500 to 5,000; third class or towns, under 500.

*Mayor-Council:* Plan is optional for first or second class cities. Mayor is not a member of the council but he presides and in case of tie has casting vote. May veto ordinances and resolutions; two-thirds vote needed to override. May also veto items of ordinances, resolutions, or appropriations. Cities may adopt plan by referendum. (Compiled Laws, 1929, Sec. 6191-92.) A board of trustees of three members is mandatory for third class cities.

*Commission:* Any first or second class city may adopt commission plan by majority vote. Mayor is elected; two or four commissioners. (Sec. 6191-92.)

*Council-Manager:* Any first or second class city may adopt the manager plan by majority vote. Mayor is elected. Three cities have adopted it. (Sec. 6231.)—HERMAN H. TRACHSEL, University of South Dakota.

## TENNESSEE

There is no classification. Petitions for incorporation in any municipality must be signed by 100 legal voters. Practically all cities and larger towns operate under special charter. Most of the cities under 5,000 are mayor-council, with slight variations from code provisions.

*Mayor-Council:* May be adopted by incorporation under general law or by special charter. The elected mayor is not a member of the council but has veto power which may be overridden by two-thirds vote.

*Commission:* May be adopted by securing special legislation.

*Council-Manager:* Any municipality may adopt optional act by election following petition of 20 per cent of the voters. (Code of 1932, Sec. 3519.) Mayor is chosen by commission from its members.—C. C. Sims, State Teachers' College, Murfreesboro.

## TEXAS

*Classification:* Cities having a population of 5,000 or less may be chartered by general laws only, while those above 5,000 may adopt or amend home rule charters (Const., Art. XI, Secs. 4 and 5). Cities set up under general law may be organized either as a "town or village" or a "city or town." Towns or villages are places between 400 and 10,000 (Vernon's Ann. Rev. Civil Statutes, Vol. 2, Art. 1133). Cities or towns comprise a population of 600 or over (*Ibid.,* Art. 966). A third classification consists of any unincorporated city or town between 500 and 5,000 and any unincorporated town or village between 200 and 1,000.

*Mayor-Council:* Cities over 5,000 may adopt this plan under home rule, and incorporated cities, towns, and villages over 600 also may adopt it by two-thirds vote of council. New incorporation is by referendum. Mayor presides over council, with vote except in selection of officers. Mayor has veto, which requires majority vote to override. (Sec. 961.)

*Commission:* Cities and towns of 500 to 5,000 may adopt this act by referendum. Ten per cent petition of voters is required for referendum on adoption of the commission form. Mayor is elected. (Sec. 1154.) May also be adopted under home rule.

*Council-Manager:* Any city of more than 5,000 may adopt the council-manager form under home rule.

*Special Charter:* Some few cities operate under special charters granted by the legislature. Each of these charters presumably was in operation when the home rule amendment went into effect in 1913, since the courts have ruled definitely that the legislature has had no right to grant charters since that amendment became operative.—Roscoe C. Martin, Bureau of Municipal Research, University of Texas.

## UTAH

*Classification:* Cities—first class, over 50,000; second class, 7,000 to 50,000; third class includes all others. Home rule charters may be framed by any incorporated city or town upon two-thirds vote of legislative body and petition of 15 per cent of votes cast for mayor, referendum for charter commission, and approval of charter commission's results (Const., Art. XI, Sec. 5).

*Mayor-Council:* This plan is compulsory for third class cities unless they make use of the home rule provisions. The mayor is presiding officer with a casting vote only. No provision is made for veto. (Revised Statutes, 1933, 15-6-3.)

*Commission:* This is compulsory for first and second class cities unless they have framed home rule charters. The mayor is presiding officer with a vote but no veto. (Revised Statutes, Ch. 15-6-1, and 15-6-2.) In cities over 50,000 a mayor and four councilmen are elected for four years; in cities from 7,000 to 50,000, a mayor and two commissioners are chosen; the former for two years, the latter for four-year terms.

*Council-Manager:* This can be obtained only under the home rule procedure described above.—Andrew L. Neff, University of Utah.

## VERMONT

Cities are chartered by legislature. There are eight cities and 240 towns in Vermont.

*Mayor-Council:* Provided by special charter only. There are no general provisions. Seven cities are operating under this form.

*Council-Manager:* Cities, villages, and towns may adopt the provision of the optional manager law by majority vote at city, town, or village election or meeting. Mayor and council, selectmen, or trustees are chosen as formerly. (Public Laws of Vermont, 1933, Chap. 149.)

Town meeting with selectmen and village government with trustees are the other two forms of government. There is no provision for the commission plan.—K. R. B. Flint, Norwich University.

## VIRGINIA

*Classification:* Cities—first class, over 10,000; second class, 5,000 to 10,000, also cities under 5,000 having a city charter when code took effect. Towns: under 5,000. Three optional plans in state code may be adopted by referendum by cities. In cities over 50,000 on petition of 25 per cent of voters, the council provides by ordinance for holding of election on charter. Charter commission of seven citizens is elected by majority vote. If charter is adopted at the special election it is submitted to the legislature. Charter may provide for new form of government or change in special charter. (Sec. 2925.) Cities under 50,000 by 10 per cent petition and referendum may adopt one of forms in optional act. (Sec. 2929.) A number of cities operate under special charters; the General Assembly has power to alter them.

*Mayor-Council:* This form is found in eight cities and a majority of the towns. In cities the mayor is not a member of council, but has veto power; two-thirds vote necessary to override. May veto appropriation measures by items. In towns the mayor is a member of the council with full voting rights. Plan may be adopted under optional act (Sec. 2936) or by special charter.

*Commission:* Cities may adopt under optional act (Sec. 2938) or by special charter. The mayor is a member of the council and is chosen by the council. Council elected for four years.

*Council-Manager:* Cities and towns may adopt under optional plan (Sec. 2942). Council appoints manager who serves three years unless removed by council. He may be reappointed for six years, subject to removal. The mayor is selected by council from its membership. Any council may employ a manager for administrative affairs without adopting entire section of law. May abandon plan after four years.—Harold I. Baumes, League of Virginia Municipalities.

## WASHINGTON

*Classification:* Cities—first class, over 20,000 (seven home rule cities); second class, 10,000 to 20,000 (three); third class, 1,500 to 10,000 (forty-four); fourth class cities, under 1,500 (163). (Remington's Revised Statutes, Title 60, Chap. 5.) Five third class cities have populations sufficient to be classed as second class cities but are not organized as such. Eight fourth class cities have populations sufficient to be classed as third class cities but are not organized as such. Commission governed cities, 13; mayor-council governed cities, 204; no council-manager cities.

*Mayor-Council:* Provided by statute for cities under 20,000, which have not adopted the commission form. In all cities under 20,000 the mayor presides but is not a member of the council. He has a veto in all but fourth class cities. In second class cities the mayor's veto may be overridden by two-thirds vote and in third class cities by vote of five of the seven councilmen. (Revised Statutes, Title 60, Chap. 12, 14, 16.)

*Commission:* Cities of 2,000 to 30,000 may adopt this plan by referendum after 25 per cent of the voters have signed a petition. Mayor and two commissioners are elected for three years. Cities over 20,000 may provide for election of commissioners as heads of designated administrative departments under home rule. (Remington's Revised Statutes, Title 60, Chap. 13.)

*Council-Manager:* Cities over 20,000 may frame own charter under home rule, including form of organization. The charter is framed by a board of fifteen freeholders appointed by legislative authority and submitted at the election. One-fourth of voters may petition for revision of charter and election of charter commission. (Revised Statutes, Title 60, Chap. 7, also state constitution, Art. XI, Sec. 10.)

Other forms of government are being considered by the committee on governmental organization and finance of the state planning council in which it is advocated that the strong mayor and council-manager plan be made optional for cities under 20,000 population.—Russell W. Barthell, Association of Washington Cities.

## WEST VIRGINIA

There is no classification of cities; municipal corporations are created under general law or by special legislative act. Any form is possible for any city by special charter granted by the legislature.

*Mayor-Council:* Specified for general law municipal corporations or obtained under special charter. Some very general provisions are set out (Official Code, 1932, Chapter 8). The mayor is a voting member of council, without veto power. A total of 190 cities have mayor-council form—many with modifications by special charter.

*Commission:* Any city may have this form by special charter; five cities now operate under this plan.

*Council-Manager:* Possible for any city by special charter; six cities use the plan.

On March 9, 1935, the legislature passed an enabling act permitting submission of a "municipal home rule" amendment to referendum vote in 1936.—Hume K. Nowlan, League of West Virginia Municipalities.

## WISCONSIN

*Classification:* Cities—first class, over 150,000 (Milwaukee only); second class, 39,000 to 150,000; third class, 10,000 to 39,000; fourth class, under 10,000. Villages over 1,200 may become cities. Territory over 1,500 containing a village may become city. Home rule: Any city or village may adopt any form of local government. However, there are no complete home rule charters in the state perhaps because general statutes are very flexible. Partial or complete home rule charters may be enacted by two-thirds vote of local legislative body, subject to referendum if petition is filed, or may thus be submitted to referendum or by petition of 15 per cent of the voters. Referendum to call charter convention may be provided in same manner. (Statutes of 1931, Sec. 6601.)

*Mayor-Council:* This is the prevailing form. In cities under 150,000 the mayor is the presiding officer and has casting vote. He may veto ordinances and three-fourths vote is required to override. The general charter law (Chapter 62) for cities repealed all special charters except for Milwaukee. First class cities may adopt Chapter 62 by ordinance.

*Commission:* Cities under 150,000 may adopt this plan; may choose a mayor and two commissioners for six years. The commission form may be adopted by charter, ordinance, under home rule, or by a 15 per cent petition and referendum. A hybrid form exists in two cities. No cities have adopted the commission plan within the last fifteen years.

*Council-Manager:* May be adopted by charter, ordinance, or by petition and referendum. Council chooses one of its members as president. There is no mayor. Villages also may adopt this plan. Seven cities and one village operate under the manager plan (Chapter 64).—Frederick N. MacMillin, League of Wisconsin Municipalities.

## WYOMING

*Classification:* Cities—first class, over 4,000; second class, 6,000 to 9,000 (a class created to enable Laramie, a special charter city, to obtain the benefits of general statutes); fourth class, 150 to 4,000.

*Mayor-Council:* Any city or town may adopt by referendum the provisions of the mayor-council statute. In first and fourth class cities the mayor is a member of the council and votes only in case of tie; in second class and special charter cities the mayor is not a member of the council but has casting vote. In all cases the mayor may veto, either directly or by failure to sign. Two-thirds vote necessary to pass over veto.

*Commission:* All cities over 4,000 may adopt by referendum (15 per cent petition) provisions of the general statute (Sec. 22-601 to 22-606). Mayor and two commissioners; the mayor is elected as such.

*Council-Manager:* All cities and towns may adopt the plan by petition of 10 per cent of the voters and referendum; either council or commission-manager plan may be chosen. In commission-manager cities five commissioners are elected for four years; in council-manager plan three councilmen from each ward chosen by board of five electors from the ward for three years. In both forms the mayor is a member of the council chosen by the council. (Sec. 22-701-704 and 22-801-803.)—G. R. McConnell, Wyoming Municipal League.

# Governmental Data on the 960 Cities Over 10,000 Population*

THE cities with more than 10,000 population which are listed in Table III were obtained directly from the enumeration made by the United States Bureau of the Census in 1930. However, Table III does not include twenty-three unincorporated townships in California, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania which were listed in the census enumeration because they "had a total population of 10,000 or more and a population density of 1,000 or more per square mile," [1] but it does include both Texarkana, Arkansas, and Texarkana, Texas, which are enumerated by the Bureau of the Census as only one city. Therefore 960 cities are listed in Table III while the census enumeration contains 982.

*Population.* The population figures for all cities are taken from the 1930 census. In past years it has been the practice of the Bureau of the Census to make annual estimates of the population of all cities of over 10,000 population based on the recorded increases from 1920 to 1930. This estimate was omitted in 1934, however, because it was felt that the apparent reversal in the depression years of the rural-to-urban migration, which had been so prevalent prior to 1930, would render such an estimate unreliable. There is some indication that this "back-to-the-farm" movement probably came to a halt in 1933.

*Form of Government.* The type of government for all cities over 10,000 is shown in Table I. More than one-half of these cities operate under the mayor-council plan while approximately equal proportions are commission and council-manager cities. The mayor-council group includes 15 cities with bicameral legislative bodies,[2] and many places of over 10,000, usually termed towns or villages, which operate under a board of trustees and president, a plan which closely resembles the mayor-council form. The town-meeting prevails in 33 cities in Massachusetts, two in Connecticut, one in New Hampshire, and one in New Jersey. No attempt has been made to distinguish between the unlimited and the representative form of town meeting for the Massachusetts towns. The representative form provides for the election of a large number of town meeting delegates on a representative basis to replace the old unwieldy type of unlimited town meeting which all qualified electors were permitted to attend. Brookline was the first Massachusetts town to experiment with this new type in 1915 but it had to secure a special charter for this purpose as did nine other municipalities. In 1926 all towns with more than 6,000 population were permitted to adopt the representative form by constitutional amendment and to date 23 have done so, of which 19 have more than 10,000 population.

---

*This article is a summary of the data for the 960 cities in Table III beginning on page 170.

[1] Cf. *Fifteenth Census of the United States* (1930): Population Bulletin, first series, United States Summary, p. 1.

[2] The fifteen cities which have bicameral legislative bodies are: New York City; Brockton, Everett, Holyoke, Malden, New Bedford, Springfield, Worcester, and Newton, Massachusetts; Pawtucket, Providence, and Woonsocket, Rhode Island; Atlanta, Georgia; New Britain, Connecticut; and Richmond, Virginia. The average number of aldermen in these cities is eight and the average number of councilmen is twenty-one. In 1903, about one-third of all cities of over twenty-five thousand population had bicameral councils; in 1917, twenty-four cities had bicameral legislative bodies; and in 1929, fifteen cities had this type of council.

## TABLE I

### FORM OF GOVERNMENT IN 959 AMERICAN CITIES BY POPULATION GROUPS*

| Population Group | Total Number of Cities | Mayor-Council |  | Commission |  | Council-Mgr. |  | Town-Meeting |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent |
| Over 500,000 ........ | 13 | 13 | 100.0 | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 200,000 to 500,000 .... | 27* | 11 | 40.8 | 10 | 37.0 | 6 | 22.2 | – | – |
| 100,000 to 200,000 .... | 52 | 30 | 57.7 | 12 | 23.1 | 10 | 19.2 | – | – |
| 30,000 to 100,000 ..... | 217 | 108 | 49.8 | 53 | 24.4 | 53 | 24.4 | 3 | 1.4 |
| 10,000 to 30,000 ...... | 650 | 388 | 59.7 | 113 | 17.4 | 115 | 17.7 | 34 | 5.2 |
| All Cities Over 10,000 .. | 959 | 550 | 57.4 | 188 | 19.6 | 184 | 19.2 | 37 | 3.8 |

* Washington, D. C., has been omitted because it is governed by Congress and an appointed commission of three which does not constitute any usual form of municipal government.

There were few changes in the form of government during 1934. Clifton, New Jersey, Schenectady, New York, and Toledo, Ohio abandoned the mayor-council plan and adopted the council-manager form. The manager plan went into effect in Clifton in 1934 but it will not go into effect in Schenectady and Toledo until 1936 and therefore these two cities are carried in Table III as mayor-council cities. Four cities abandoned the commission plan and adopted the mayor-council form: Aurora and LaSalle, Illinois, Huntington, West Virginia, and Lawrence, Kansas (not effective in Lawrence until April 1, 1935). Easthampton, Massachusetts, adopted the representative town meeting plan under which there are to be 176 members of the town meeting who elect three selectmen for one-year terms. Stamford, Connecticut, transformed its weak-mayor form of government into the strong-mayor type, abolishing all boards and placing the mayor in charge of all departments. Fall River, Massachusetts, abandoned council-manager government (Plan D under the Massachusetts optional charter law) in 1934 for the strong-mayor form (Plan A).[3]

---

[3] For other administrative changes not affecting the fundamental form of government Cf. John Blandford "Administrative Organization," page 7 this YEAR BOOK.

*Number of Councilmen.* Variations in the number of councilmen for the various forms of government and population groups are shown in Table 2. The mode indicates the most frequent number of councilmen in the class while the median indicates the middle item when the numbers for the various cities are arrayed according to size. The median rather than the arithmetic average was selected as a summarizing figure for this purpose because it gives less weight to the bicameral councils of extreme size in some eastern and southern cities. For example, New York has a council of 72 members; Providence, Rhode Island, a council of 52; and Worcester, Massachusetts, one of 41. The range indicates the smallest and the largest councils in each group of cities.

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF COUNCILMEN IN 959 CITIES OVER 10,000 POPULATION BY POPULATION GROUPS AND TYPE OF GOVERNMENT*

| | Mayor-Council | | | Commission | | | Council-Manager | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Population Group | Range | Mode | Median | Range | Mode | Median | Range | Mode | Median |
| Over 500,000 | 9–72 | – | 22 | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 200,000 to 500,000 | 7–52 | – | 13 | 3–7 | 5 | 5 | 5–9 | 9 | 9 |
| 100,000 to 200,000 | 5–41 | – | 15 | 4–5 | 5 | 5 | 5–14 | – | 9 |
| 30,000 to 100,000 | 4–32 | – | 10 | 3–7 | 5 | 5 | 3–17 | 5 | 7 |
| 10,000 to 30,000 | 3–32 | 7 | 7 | 3–6 | 3 | 3 | 3–15 | 5 | 5 |
| All Cities Over 10,000 | 3–72 | 7 | 8 | 3–7 | 5 | 5 | 3–17 | 5 | 5 |

* Washington, D. C., has been omitted from this table because it is governed by Congress and an appointed commission of three.

It appears from data in Table 2 that in all forms of government the size of the council tends to decrease with the size of the city. This is probably due to a diminishing need for group representation in the smaller cities. As would be expected, councils in the commission cities are smaller than under the other two forms of government. However, the median size of councils in all council-manager cities is the same as the median size for all commission cities and tends to exceed the latter only in cities with more than 30,000 population. The councils of mayor-council cities greatly exceed in size those of the other two forms of government in the larger cities but tend to approach the others in size in the cities from 10,000 to 30,000 population. In cities with the town meeting plan, the range in number of selectmen is three to ten with 27 of the 37 cities having three selectmen.

At least two changes in the size of councils were made in 1934. An Indiana statute passed in 1933 reduced the number of councilmen in all cities and provided that they be elected at large but nominated from districts. The largest Indiana cities now have nine councilmen; the cities between 10,000 and 35,000, seven councilmen; and cities from 3,000 to 10,000, five councilmen. For example, the number of councilmen in Hammond was reduced from eighteen to nine and in Evansville and South Bend from twelve to nine. The position of the mayor in the smaller Indiana cities has been strengthened by increasing his appointing power. A special legislative act in Connecticut created sixteen districts in Bridgeport in place of twelve and reduced the number of aldermen in each district from two to one and the total number from twenty-four to sixteen. The number of councilmen carried in Table III for the representative town meeting towns in Massachusetts is the number of selectmen, which is the continuing governing body of the town, rather than the number in the town meeting which has final legislative authority but which meets only periodically.

*Terms of Councilmen.* Terms of office for city councils show relatively little variation. The choice in most cities as indicated in Table 3 narrows down to the two or the four year term with mayor-council cities preferring the two year term, commission cities preferring the four year term, and council-manager cities being about equally divided between the two. A few of the smaller cities between 10,000 and 30,000 continue to hold annual council elections, most of them having the town meeting form of government. Three year terms are in effect in some cities mostly in the smallest population group while a few scattering cities prefer longer five and six year terms.[4]

### TABLE 3

TERMS OF OFFICE FOR 959 CITY COUNCILS
ACCORDING TO FORM OF GOVERNMENT*

| Council Term of Office | All Cities Over 10,000 | No. of Mayor-Council Cities | No. of Commission Cities | No. of Council-Manager Cities | No. of Town-Meeting Cities |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 year | 23 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 15 |
| 2 years | 472 | 341 | 50 | 79 | 2 |
| 3 years | 72 | 25 | 21 | 14 | 12 |
| 4 years | 364 | 172 | 108 | 83 | 1 |
| 5 years | 7 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| 6 years | 9 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Not Reporting | 12 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| Total | 959 | 550 | 188 | 184 | 37 |

* Washington, D. C., has been omitted because it is governed by Congress and an appointed commission of three.

*Voting in Municipal Elections.* An analysis of the number of votes cast in council elections in 800 cities according to the population over 21[5], the number of registered voters, and the number of voters in the last council election is contained in Table 4. Cities in the larger population groups show a greater percentage of registered voters actually voting than the smaller cities while cities from 10,000 to 30,000 population show the largest percentage of persons over 21 actually voting. According to these data, only two-fifths of the population over 21 in all cities participated in the last council election—the remainder refraining because of lack of citizenship, lack of interest, sickness, or some other reason. This proportion may be compared with the approximately 54 per cent of the total population over 21 in the United States which voted in the presidential election of 1932.

---

[4] Information as to the type and method of council election, and the salaries of the mayors and councilmen in all cities over 30,000 is contained in THE MUNICIPAL YEAR BOOK, 1934, pp. 101-106.

[5] Obtained from *15th Census of the U. S.*, Vol. III, Parts 1 and 2, Table 15.

Small proportions of voters in the general elections in some southern cities may be attributed to the fact that actual contests are known to take place in the Democratic primary and the general election fails to arouse interest. In certain cities the number voting is the same as the number of registered voters because of the fact that the registration lists are "purged" of all non-voters at each election.

TABLE 4

NUMBER OF VOTERS IN COUNCIL ELECTIONS IN 800 AMERICAN CITIES*

| Pop. Group | Pop. Over 21 in 1930 | Registered Voters, 1934 | | Voters Last Council Election | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Number | Per Cent of Pop. Over 21 | Number | Per Cent Registered | Per Cent of Pop. Over 21 |
| Over 500,000 .......... | 13,635,722 | 7,564,486 | 56.9 | 5,348,956 | 70.7 | 39.2 |
| 200,000 to 500,000...... | 5,300,794 | 3,262,879 | 61.6 | 2,311,736 | 70.9 | 43.6 |
| 100,000 to 200,000...... | 3,343,130 | 2,009,677 | 60.1 | 1,233,025 | 61.3 | 36.9 |
| 30,000 to 100,000....... | 5,889,837 | 3,763,922 | 63.9 | 2,491,951 | 66.2 | 42.3 |
| 10,000 to 30,000........ | 5,402,458 | 3,663,124 | 67.8 | 2,475,709 | 67.6 | 45.8 |
| All Cities Over 10,000 | 33,571,941 | 20,264,088 | 60.4 | 13,861,377 | 68.4 | 41.3 |

* Because of inadequate data two cities from 200,000 to 500,000 population, eleven cities from 100,000 to 200,000, thirty-five cities from 30,000 to 100,000 and 112 cities from 10,000 to 30,000 have been excluded from this table.

*Municipally Owned Utilities.* Of the 927 cities over 10,000 reporting on the ownership of utilities as shown in Table 5, 70 per cent reported owning a water works, 28 per cent reported an airport, 14 per cent an electric light plant, and 12 per cent a public market. Of the 126 cities reporting ownership of an electric light generating and distributing system, 90 are cities in the 10,000 to 30,000 population group, and the total figure is 15 per cent of the 869 cities of all sizes in the United States which have such a system.[6] Only 13 cities stated that they own an electric distribution system which purchases power from private sources. All cities over 200,000 population reported owning one or more utilities, and only four cities from 100,000 to 200,000 population reported no utilities owned by the city. Of the 927 cities of over 10,000 population which reported on ownership of utilities, 187 or 20 per cent own no utilities and 152 of these are in the 10,000 to 30,000 population group. The four cities with more than 500,000 population which reported ownership of street railways are Baltimore, Detroit, New York, and San Francisco. The two cities in this group owning gas plants are Baltimore and Philadelphia, and the four owning electric light plants are Baltimore, Cleveland, Detroit, and Los Angeles.

---

[6] The last figure is reported in Edna C. Macmahon, *Municipal Electric Plant Managers.* Public Administration Service, (Chicago, 1934) pp. 18-24.

TABLE 5

OWNERSHIP AND OPERATION OF UTILITIES AS REPORTED BY 927 AMERICAN CITIES

| Type of Utility | All Cities Over 10,000 | Number of Cities | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Over 500,000 | 200,000 to 500,000 | 100,000 to 200,000 | 30,000 to 100,000 | 10,000 to 30,000 |
| Abattoir | 36 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 18 |
| Airport | 261 | 12 | 22 | 27 | 58 | 142 |
| Electric Distrib. | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 |
| Electric Light | 126 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 25 | 90 |
| Gas | 29 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 20 |
| Gas Distrib. | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Market | 109 | 8 | 14 | 12 | 36 | 39 |
| Port | 61 | 6 | 10 | 13 | 15 | 17 |
| Street Railway | 15 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Water Works | 651 | 12 | 25 | 42 | 151 | 421 |
| No Utilities | 187 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 31 | 152 |
| Not Reporting | 33 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 21 |

## TABLE III

## DIRECTORY AND GOVERNMENTAL DATA FOR THE 960 CITIES OF OVER 10,000 POPULATION

This table includes all cities in the United States over 10,000 population (1930 federal census) but not 23 townships classed by the Census Bureau as urban places. Cities are arranged alphabetically within five population groups; population for cities over 100,000 is given in thousands. Data on land areas, supplied by the Bureau of the Census, were reported to the Bureau by local officials in 1933. Under "Form of Government" mayor-council cities are indicated by "MC"; council-manager cities by "Mgr"; commission cities by "Com"; and town meeting cities by "TM." In council-manager and commission governed cities, the number of members of the council, shown in column five, generally includes the mayor; in mayor-council cities the mayor is usually an additional officer. Data on population over 21 are based on U. S. Census *Population,* Vol. III, Part 1 and 2. Utilities owned and operated are indicated as follows: electric light plant "E"; electric distribution system only "Ed"; gas plant "G"; gas distribution system only "Gd"; water works "W"; port facilities "P"; public market "M"; street railway "S"; airplane landing field "A"; abattoir "Ab." These data were reported in February, 1935, by local officials. An asterisk (*) refers to notes at the end of the table.

| City | Population 1930 (000 omitted) | Land Area in Acres | Form of Government | CITY COUNCIL | | Number Registered Voters | Number Voted Last Council Election | Population over 21 in 1930 | Utilities Owned and Operated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Number of Councilmen and Term of Years | Next Election and Number to be Elected | | | | |
| ***Over 500,000*** | | | | | | | | | |
| Baltimore, Md. ...... | 805 | 50,381 | MC | 19—4 | 5-7-35—19 | 354,370 | 184,026 | 516,614 | EPMASGW |
| Boston, Mass. ....... | 781 | 28,096 | MC | 22—2 | 11-5-35—22 | 302,162 | 249,198 | 507,711 | MA |
| Buffalo, N. Y. ...... | 573 | 24,894 | MC | 15—2* | 11- -35—12 | 204,048 | 194,324 | 362,067 | WPMA |
| Chicago, Ill. ........ | 3,376 | 129,302 | MC | 50—4 | 2-26-35—50 | 1,485,441 | 670,929 | 2,209,514 | WA |
| Cleveland, Ohio..... | 900 | 46,774 | MC | 33—2 | 11-5-35—33 | 338,347 | 288,324 | 562,851 | EWMA |
| Detroit, Mich. ...... | 1,569 | 88,256 | MC | 9—2 | 11- -35—9 | 573,631 | 305,396 | 991,100 | EWMSA |
| Los Angeles, Calif... | 1,238 | 287,520 | MC | 15—2 | 5-7-35—15 | 563,216 | 345,281 | 891,136 | EWPA |
| Milwaukee, Wis. .... | 578 | 27,732 | MC | 27—4 | 4- -36—27 | 235,000 | 175,246 | 373,553 | EdWPM |
| New York, N. Y..... | 6,930 | 191,360 | MC | 72*—2 | 11-5-35—65 | 1,977,360 | 2,043,485 | 4,511,021 | WPMSA |
| Philadelphia, Pa. .... | 1,951 | 81,920 | MC | 22—4 | 11-5-35—22 | 610,000 | 400,000 | 1,260,238 | GWPA |
| Pittsburgh, Pa. ...... | 670 | 33,365 | MC | 9—4 | 11-5-35—4 | 222,251 | 179,788 | 413,924 | WA |
| St. Louis, Mo. ...... | 822 | 39,277 | MC | 29—4 | 4-7-35—15 | 378,660 | 146,968 | 560,655 | WMA |
| San Francisco, Calif. . | 634 | 26,880 | MC | 11—4 | 11-5-35—6 | 320,000 | 165,991 | 475,338 | WASAb |
| ***200,000 to 500,000*** | | | | | | | | | |
| Akron, Ohio ........ | 255 | 34,444 | MC | 13—2 | 11-5-35—13 | 92,617 | 56,870 | 157,150 | WA |
| Atlanta, Ga. ........ | 270 | 21,933 | MC | 39—3 | 12- -35—19 | 19,998 | 1,667 | 170,260 | WA |
| Birmingham, Ala .... | 260 | 32,128 | Com | 3—4 | 10-3-37—3 | 39,111 | 16,318 | 160,754 | A |
| Cincinnati, Ohio .... | 451 | 45,979 | Mgr | 9—2 | 11-5-35—9 | 222,579 | 163,749 | 308,238 | WPMSA |
| Columbus, Ohio .... | 291 | 24,677 | MC | 7—4 | 11-5-35—4 | 112,000 | 94,700 | 196,138 | EWMA |
| Dallas, Tex. ........ | 260 | 26,186 | Mgr | 9—2 | 4-2-35—9 | 49,900 | 18,600 | 170,488 | WA |
| Dayton, Ohio ...... | 201 | 15,176 | Mgr | 5—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 86,000 | 81,650 | 132,788 | WMA |
| Denver, Colo. ....... | 288 | 37,085 | MC | 9—2 | 5-21-35—9 | 107,385 | 60,000 | 196,378 | WA |
| Houston, Tex. ...... | 292 | 45,963 | Com | 4—2 | 11- -36—5 | 65,000 | 40,000 | 190,150 | GWPM |
| Indianapolis, Ind. .... | 364 | 33,624 | MC | 9—4 | 11- -38—9 | 213,154 | 147,794 | 244,466 | MA |
| Jersey City, N. J. .... | 317 | 8,320 | Com | 5—4 | 11- -37—5 | 151,219 | 114,489 | 193,803 | W |
| Kansas City, Mo. .... | 400 | 37,472 | Mgr | 9—4 | 3- -38—9 | 252,614 | 223,015 | 280,895 | WMA |
| Louisville, Ky. ...... | 308 | 23,024 | MC | 12—2 | 11-4-35—12 | 145,000 | 130,000 | 202,446 | WPA |
| Memphis, Tenn. .... | 253 | 29,228 | Com | 5—4 | 11- -35—5 | 42,000 | .... | 167,868 | WAPM |
| Minneapolis, Minn. .. | 464 | 35,445 | MC | 26—4 | 6-10-35—13 | 243,983 | 104,402 | 308,983 | WPA |
| Newark, N. J. ...... | 442 | 10,927 | Com | 5—4 | .... | 161,008 | 121,727 | 273,594 | WA |
| New Orleans, La. .... | 459 | 127,808 | Com | 5—4 | 1- -38—5 | 127,642 | 109,000 | 290,421 | WMPA |

Table III.—Governmental Data for the Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Population 1930 (000 omitted) | Land Area in Acres | Form of Government | CITY COUNCIL | | Number Registered Voters | Number Voted Last Council Election | Population over 21 in 1930 | Utilities Owned and Operated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Number of Councilmen and Term of Years | Next Election and Number to be Elected | | | | |
| ***200,000 to 500,000—continued*** | | | | | | | | | |
| Oakland, Calif. | 284 | 34,023 | Mgr | 9—4 | 5-3-35—5 | 161,222 | 67,000 | 197,103 | PA |
| Omaha, Neb. | 214 | 25,027 | Com | 7—3 | 5- -36—7 | 94,207 | 72,162 | 138,700 | GWA |
| Portland, Ore. | 302 | 40,614 | Com | 5—4 | 11- -36—2 | 150,000 | 87,000 | 211,787 | W |
| Providence, R. I. | 253 | 11,462 | MC | 52—2 | 11-3-36—52 | 103,270 | 84,149 | 158,427 | W |
| Rochester, N. Y. | 328 | 21,925 | Mgr | 9—4 | 11-5-35—4 | 126,445 | 121,620 | 215,429 | WPMA |
| St. Paul, Minn. | 272 | 33,389 | Com | 6—2 | 5- -36—6 | 133,905 | 96,263 | 176,435 | WPMA |
| San Antonio, Texas | 232 | 22,860 | Com | 5—2 | 5-14-35—5 | 41,330 | 19,189 | 141,006 | WMA |
| Seattle, Wash. | 366 | 43,840 | MC | 9—3 | 3-12-35—3 | 157,290 | 112,062 | 256,604 | EWPMSA |
| Syracuse, N. Y. | 209 | 16,220 | MC | 19—2 | 11-5-35—19 | 100,000 | 88,310 | 137,327 | WMA |
| Toledo, Ohio | 291 | 21,986 | MC* | 21—2 | 11-5-35—9 | 106,000 | 80,000 | 191,024 | WS |
| Washington, D. C. | 487 | 39,680 | * | *—* | .... | .... | .... | 341,465 | WM |
| ***100,000 to 200,000*** | | | | | | | | | |
| Albany, N. Y. | 127 | 12,076 | MC | 19—4 | 11- -37—19 | .... | .... | 88,740 | WPMA |
| Bridgeport, Conn. | 147 | 9,370 | MC | 16—2 | 11-5-35—16 | 55,475 | 46,798 | 89,572 | Ab |
| Cambridge, Mass. | 114 | 3,968 | MC | 15—2 | 11-4-35—15 | 44,265 | 36,109 | 73,384 | W |
| Camden, N. J. | 119 | 5,544 | Com | 5—4 | 5- -35—5 | 52,556 | 39,891 | 71,286 | W |
| Canton, Ohio | 105 | 8,716 | MC | 14—2 | 11-5-35—14 | 42,000 | 31,000 | 65,595 | W |
| Chattanooga, Tenn. | 120 | 17,549 | Com | 5—4 | 3-12-35—4 | .... | .... | 72,708 | .... |
| Des Moines, Iowa | 143 | 34,560 | Com | 5—2 | 3- -36—5 | 75,000 | 39,367 | 93,054 | WMA |
| Duluth, Minn. | 101 | 39,897 | Com | 5—4 | 4-2-35—2 | 46,753 | 35,758 | 63,253 | GWA |
| Elizabeth, N. J. | 115 | 6,232 | MC | 13—2 | 11- -35—7 | 46,487 | 37,380 | 70,001 | W |
| El Paso, Tex. | 102 | 8,640 | MC | 5—2 | 4-8-35—5 | 15,000 | 5,387 | 58,942 | WA |
| Erie, Pa. | 116 | 10,368 | Com | 5—4 | 11-5-35—4 | .... | .... | 69,136 | W |
| Evansville, Ind. | 102 | 5,577 | MC | 9—4 | 11- -38—9 | 54,642 | 41,401 | 66,545 | WPMAAb |
| Fall River, Mass. | 115 | 21,056 | MC | 9—2 | 12- -36—9 | 43,522 | 37,424 | 67,659 | W |
| Flint, Mich. | 156 | 18,955 | Mgr | 9—2 | 11- -36—9 | 60,329 | 32,877 | 94,851 | WMA |
| Fort Wayne, Ind. | 115 | 11,331 | MC | 9—4 | 11- -38—9 | 55,000 | 40,000 | 74,816 | EWA |
| Fort Worth, Tex. | 163 | 29,696 | Mgr | 9—2 | 4-2-35—9 | 29,000 | 10,050 | 104,456 | WA |
| Gary, Ind. | 100 | 25,811 | MC | 9—4 | 11- -38—9 | 40,000 | .... | 61,073 | None |
| Grand Rapids, Mich. | 169 | 14,735 | Mgr | 7—2 | 3-4-35—3 | 61,602 | 29,988 | 106,606 | WM |
| Hartford, Conn. | 164 | 10,163 | MC | 20—2 | 11-5-35—20 | 63,869 | 50,721 | 104,871 | WPMA |
| Jacksonville, Fla. | 130 | 19,130 | MC | 23—2 | 4- -35—23 | 23,000 | 12,647 | 82,984 | EWPA |
| Kansas City, Kans. | 122 | 12,937 | Com | 4—4 | 4-2-35—3 | 48,000 | 33,000 | 75,342 | EW |
| Knoxville, Tenn. | 106 | 16,896 | Mgr | 11—2 | 11- -35—11 | 15,000 | 8,000 | 63,502 | WMAAb |
| Long Beach, Calif. | 142 | 18,974 | Mgr | 9—3 | 6-2-36—9 | 85,000 | 28,665 | 102,649 | GWPMA |
| Lowell, Mass. | 100 | 8,576 | MC | 15—2 | 12- -35—15 | .... | .... | 62,043 | W |
| Lynn, Mass. | 102 | 6,720 | MC | 11—2 | 11-5-35—11 | 42,497 | 25,000 | 66,736 | W |
| Miami, Fla. | 111 | 19,200 | Mgr | 5—2* | 5-14-35—3 | 20,600 | 11,453 | 73,078 | WPMSA |
| Nashville, Tenn. | 154 | 16,639 | MC | 27—4 | 5-2-35—27 | 40,000 | 18,000 | 97,871 | EWMA |
| New Bedford, Mass. | 113 | 12,160 | MC | 30—2 | 12-7-37—30 | 38,901 | 30,823 | 69,647 | W |
| New Haven, Conn. | 163 | 11,460 | MC | 33—2 | 11-5-35—33 | 66,430 | 54,544 | 99,539 | A |
| Norfolk, Va. | 130 | 17,920 | Mgr | 5—4 | 6-9-36—2 | 38,344 | 6,242 | 82,660 | WPM |
| Oklahoma City, Okla. | 185 | 19,424 | Mgr | 9—4 | 4-2-35—4 | .... | .... | 119,886 | WA |
| Paterson, N. J. | 139 | 5,157 | MC | 11—2 | 11- -35— | 56,718 | .... | 89,066 | None |
| Peoria, Ill. | 105 | 7,859 | MC | 20—2 | 4-2-34—20 | 46,445 | 26,383 | 71,261 | .... |
| Reading, Pa. | 111 | 6,091 | Com | 5—4 | 11-5-35—3 | 32,000 | 27,000 | 71,333 | W |
| Richmond, Va. | 183 | 15,347 | MC | 32—2* | 6-9-36—26 | 54,071 | 2,500 | 116,873 | EGWPMA |
| Salt Lake City, Utah | 140 | 33,492 | Com | 5—4 | 11-5-35—3 | 86,000 | 25,560 | 82,525 | WPA |
| San Diego, Calif. | 148 | 60,582 | Mgr | 7—4 | 3-26-35—4 | 85,028 | 36,048 | 103,133 | WPA |
| Scranton, Pa. | 143 | 12,362 | MC | 5—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 48,912 | 42,830 | 84,151 | None |
| Somerville, Mass. | 104 | 2,496 | MC | 21—2 | 11-5-35—11 | 40,608 | 33,655 | 66,600 | None |
| South Bend, Ind. | 104 | 10,793 | MC | 9—4 | 11- -38—9 | .... | 39,000 | 64,049 | W |
| Spokane, Wash. | 116 | 26,547 | Com | 5—4 | 3-12-35—2 | 46,365 | 39,657 | 77,986 | WA |
| Springfield, Mass. | 150 | 20,288 | MC | 26—2 | 11-5-35—26 | 60,618 | 49,325 | 97,246 | W |
| Tacoma, Wash. | 107 | 29,661 | Com | 5—4 | 3-6-36—2 | 45,563 | 33,576 | 70,317 | EWPSA |
| Tampa, Fla. | 101 | 12,160 | MC | 12—4 | 11-5-35—6 | 14,040 | 10,000 | 62,255 | WPA |
| Trenton, N. J. | 123 | 4,630 | Com | 5—4 | 5-14-35—5 | 45,503 | 24,360 | 75,652 | W |

Table III.—Governmental Data for the Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Population 1930 | Land Area in Acres | Form of Government | City Council | | Number Registered Voters | Number Voted Last Council Election | Population over 21 in 1930 | Utilities Owned and Operated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Number of Councilmen and Term of Years | Next Election and Number to be Elected | | | | |
| ***100,000 to 200,000—continued*** | | | | | | | | | |
| Tulsa, Okla. | 141 | 13,841 | Com | 5—2 | 4-6-36—5 | 40,000 | 25,000 | 91,427 | WA |
| Utica, N. Y. | 102 | 13,569 | MC | 17—2 | 11-5-35—17 | .... | .... | 64,743 | A |
| Wichita, Kans. | 111 | 13,419 | Mgr | 15—2 | 4-2-35—3 | 59,850 | 16,907 | 71,949 | A |
| Wilmington, Del. | 107 | 4,784 | MC | 13—2 | 6-1-35—13 | 62,000 | 35,085 | 68,111 | WP |
| Worcester, Mass. | 195 | 23,808 | MC | 41—2 | 11-5-35—41 | 79,392 | 62,614 | 123,412 | W |
| Yonkers, N. Y. | 135 | 12,880 | MC | 12—2 | 11-5-35—12 | .... | .... | 83,786 | W |
| Youngstown, Ohio | 170 | 21,660 | MC | 8—2 | 11-5-35—8 | .... | 44,980 | 99,358 | WA |
| ***30,000 to 100,000*** | | | | | | | | | |
| Alameda, Calif. | 35,033 | 4,149 | Mgr | 5—4 | 11-6-36—3 | 20,000 | 16,000 | 23,846 | E |
| Allentown, Pa. | 92,563 | 10,048 | Com | 4—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 22,921 | 17,268 | 58,329 | W |
| Alton, Ill. | 30,151 | 4,077 | MC | 14—2 | 4-2-35—14 | 12,000 | 3,344 | 19,198 | .... |
| Altoona, Pa. | 82,054 | 5,606 | Com | 5—4 | 11-5-35—3 | 19,440 | 13,347 | 49,177 | W |
| Amarillo, Tex. | 43,143 | 10,816 | Mgr | 3—2 | 4-2-35—3 | 10,150 | 3,670 | 26,697 | WA |
| Amsterdam, N. Y. | 34,817 | 3,484 | MC | 8—2 | 11-5-35—8 | 13,000 | 12,433 | 21,508 | W |
| Anderson, Indiana | 39,804 | 4,121 | MC | 9—4 | 11-7-38—9 | 25,000 | 19,000 | 25,302 | EW |
| Arlington, Mass. | 36,094 | 3,328 | TM | 3—3 | 3-4-35—1 | 18,000 | 12,500 | 23,821 | None |
| Asheville, N. C. | 50,193 | 11,400 | Mgr | 9—2 | 5-14-35—9 | 23,000 | 8,000 | 30,673 | WM |
| Atlantic City, N. J. | 66,198 | 7,362 | Com | 5—4 | 5- -36—5 | 35,762 | 27,411 | 46,806 | WMA |
| Auburn, N. Y. | 36,652 | 5,390 | Mgr | 5—4 | 11-5-35—3 | 14,516 | 12,238 | 24,225 | W |
| Augusta, Ga. | 60,342 | 5,995 | MC | 14—3 | 12- -35—7 | 9,998 | 7,345 | 37,361 | WPA |
| Aurora, Ill. | 46,589 | 5,133 | MC | 15—2 | 4-2-35—14 | 17,000 | .... | 30,290 | EW |
| Austin, Tex. | 53,120 | 12,500 | Mgr | 5—2 | 4-1-35—5 | 7,235 | .... | 33,811 | EMAAb |
| Baton Rouge, La. | 30,729 | 2,366 | Com | 3—4 | 11- -36—3 | .... | .... | 19,449 | PAb |
| Battle Creek, Mich. | 43,573 | 6,374 | Com | 5—2 | 4-1-35—3 | .... | .... | 29,025 | .... |
| Bay City, Mich. | 47,355 | 6,317 | Mgr | 9—2 | 4-1-35—9 | 20,000 | 15,000 | 28,093 | EdWPMA |
| Bayonne, N. J. | 88,979 | 2,800 | Com | 5—4 | 5-14-35—5 | 37,934 | 19,219 | 49,959 | None |
| Beaumont, Tex. | 57,732 | 6,465 | Mgr | 15—2 | 4-2-35—6 | 9,089 | 804 | 35,322 | WPMAAb |
| Bellingham, Wash. | 30,823 | 11,981 | MC | 7—2 | 12-7-35—4 | 14,653 | 8,832 | 20,302 | W |
| Berkeley, Calif. | 82,109 | 6,095 | Mgr | 9—4 | 5-7-35—5 | 42,774 | 19,352 | 57,523 | PA |
| Berwyn, Ill. | 47,027 | .... | MC | 14—2 | 4-2-35—14 | 22,000 | 14,000 | 30,259 | W |
| Bethlehem, Pa. | 57,892 | 11,180 | MC | 5—4 | 11- -35—2 | 14,720 | 9,000 | 33,144 | WM |
| Binghamton, N. Y. | 76,662 | 5,945 | Mgr | 7—4 | 11-5-35—4 | 28,000 | 25,000 | 50,663 | W |
| Bloomfield, N. J. | 38,077 | 3,429 | MC | 7—2 | 11- -35—3 | 19,000 | 10,000 | 24,778 | W |
| Bloomington, Ill. | 30,930 | 2,980 | MC | 14—2 | 4-2-35—14 | 16,125 | 10,263 | 21,023 | EWA |
| Brockton, Mass. | 63,797 | 13,696 | MC | 28—2 | .... | .... | .... | 41,803 | .... |
| Brookline, Mass. | 47,490 | 4,224 | TM | 5—3 | 3-5-35—1 | 21,487 | 13,794 | 34,743 | EW |
| Butte, Mont. | 39,532 | 3,319 | MC | 16—2 | 4-1-35—8 | 12,000 | 8,700 | 27,121 | A |
| Cedar Rapids, Iowa | 56,097 | 17,658 | Com | 5—2 | 3- -36—5 | 29,071 | 17,556 | 37,296 | W |
| Charleston, S. C. | 62,265 | 2,874 | MC | 24—4 | 12-3-35—24 | 15,000 | .... | 36,728 | WPMAAb |
| Charleston, W. Va. | 60,408 | 4,921 | MC | 22—4 | 4-15-35—22 | 39,000 | 27,285 | 36,929 | None |
| Charlotte, N. C. | 82,675 | 12,390 | Mgr | 5—2 | 5-7-35—5 | 20,000 | 8,828 | 49,823 | W |
| Chelsea, Mass. | 45,816 | 1,216 | MC | 9—2 | 11-12-35—9 | 14,672 | 13,146 | 26,730 | W |
| Chester, Pa. | 59,164 | 2,869 | Com | 4—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 18,000 | 15,745 | 35,591 | None |
| Chicopee, Mass. | 43,930 | 14,656 | MC | 17—2* | 12-2-35—5 | 17,800 | 10,335 | 24,019 | EW |
| Cicero, Ill. | 66,602 | 3,678 | MC | 8—4 | 4-2-35—1 | 31,195 | 17,000 | 41,074 | E |
| Cleveland Hgts., Ohio | 50,945 | 5,133 | Mgr | 7—4 | 11-5-35—3 | 18,000 | 10,000 | 34,745 | None |
| Clifton, N. J. | 46,875 | 7,162 | Mgr | 7—4 | 5- -38—7 | 20,676 | 12,533 | 28,080 | W |
| Colorado Springs, Colo. | 33,237 | 5,740 | Mgr | 9—6 | 4-2-35—3 | 13,884 | 7,488 | 22,871 | None |
| Columbia, S. C. | 51,581 | 5,763 | Com | 5—4 | 4- -36—2 | 12,000 | 9,000 | 32,002 | None |
| Columbus, Ga. | 43,131 | 3,800 | Mgr | 5—5 | 12- -35—1 | 4,000 | 1,826 | 25,388 | WA |
| Council Bluffs, Iowa | 42,048 | 8,765 | MC | 8—2 | 3-31-36—8 | 20,688 | 12,666 | 26,057 | WA |
| Covington, Ky. | 65,252 | 4,160 | Mgr | 5—2 | 11- -35—5 | 18,936 | .... | 42,696 | W |
| Cranston, R. I. | 42,911 | 18,360 | MC | 20—2 | 1-4-37—20 | 18,399 | 15,930 | 27,397 | None |
| Cumberland, Md. | 37,747 | 5,110 | Com | 5—2 | 3- -36—5 | 17,200 | .... | 23,148 | W |
| Danville, Ill. | 36,475 | 6,290 | Com | 5—4 | 4-2-35—4 | 17,000 | 15,000 | 23,974 | None |
| Davenport, Iowa | 60,751 | 11,563 | MC | 8—2 | 4- -36—8 | 31,616 | 18,970 | 40,819 | PA |
| Dearborn, Mich. | 50,358 | 15,980 | MC | 7—2 | 11-5-35—7 | 24,000 | 12,120 | 30,003 | W |

TABLE III.—GOVERNMENTAL DATA FOR THE CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued

| City | Population 1930 | Land Area in Acres | Form of Government | CITY COUNCIL |  | Number Registered Voters | Number Voted Last Council Election | Population over 21 in 1930 | Utilities Owned and Operated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  | Number of Councilmen and Term of Years | Next Election and Number to be Elected |  |  |  |  |
| ***30,000 to 100,000—continued*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Decatur, Ill. | 57,510 | 6,100 | Com | 5—4 | 4-16-35—5 | 31,000 | 22,366 | 37,071 | EW |
| Dubuque, Iowa | 41,679 | 6,080 | Mgr | 5—3 | 3-25-35—2 | 21,000 | 10,731 | 26,411 | WPA |
| Durham, N. C. | 52,037 | 8,480 | Mgr | 13—4 | 5-8-35—7 | .... | 7,077 | 29,993 | WM |
| East Chicago, Ind. | 54,784 | 6,885 | MC | 9—4 | 11-4-35—4 | 19,000 | 15,621 | 31,558 | W |
| East Cleveland, Ohio | 39,667 | 1,930 | Mgr | 5—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 17,000 | 14,889 | 28,502 | W |
| Easton, Pa. | 34,468 | 2,089 | MC | 4—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 10,177 | 8,128 | 22,005 | None |
| East Orange, N. J. | 68,020 | 2,502 | MC | 10—2 | 11- -35—5 | 34,841 | 22,355 | 49,152 | W |
| East St. Louis, Ill. | 74,347 | 8,562 | Com | 5—4 | 4-2-35—5 | 36,344 | .... | 46,687 | None |
| Elgin, Ill. | 35,929 | 4,331 | Com | 5—4 | 4-16-35—5 | 14,000 | 12,806 | 25,937 | W |
| Elkhart, Ind. | 32,949 | 6,130 | MC | 7—4 | 11- -38—7 | .... | .... | 21,180 | None |
| Elmira, N. Y. | 47,397 | 4,451 | Mgr | 5—4* | 11-5-35—2 | 22,500 | 19,800 | 31,430 | W |
| Evanston, Ill. | 63,338 | 5,238 | MC | 16—2 | 4-2-35—16 | 26,875 | 16,214 | 43,617 | W |
| Everett, Mass. | 48,424 | 2,176 | MC | 25—2 | .... | .... | .... | 29,214 | .... |
| Everett, Wash. | 30,567 | 4,672 | Com | 3—4 | 12-7-35—3 | 12,500 | 7,500 | 19,988 | W |
| Fitchburg, Mass. | 40,692 | 17,600 | MC | 11—2 | 11-5-35—11 | 16,840 | 13,627 | 24,658 | W |
| Fort Smith, Ark. | 31,429 | 8,530 | Com | 3—4 | 3-24-35—1 | 5,500 | 1,219 | 19,174 | WAb |
| Fresno, Calif. | 52,513 | 5,601 | Com | 5—4 | 4-8-35—2 | 22,000 | 16,497 | 33,569 | WA |
| Galveston, Tex. | 52,938 | 4,986 | Com | 5—2 | 5-14-35—5 | .... | .... | 35,583 | WPA |
| Glendale, Calif. | 62,736 | 12,294 | Mgr | 5—4 | 4-9-35—2 | 36,000 | 17,752 | 43,707 | EW |
| Green Bay, Wis. | 37,415 | 8,356 | MC | 21—2 | 4-2-35—10 | 21,574 | 7,300 | 22,887 | W |
| Greensboro, N. C. | 53,569 | 11,535 | Mgr | 7—2 | 5-6-35—7 | 10,000 | 4,800 | 30,955 | WAAb |
| Hagerstown, Md. | 30,861 | 4,236 | MC | 5—4 | 3-4-37—5 | 14,000 | 10,000 | 19,128 | EWMA |
| Hamilton, Ohio | 52,176 | 5,216 | Mgr | 7—2 | 11-12-35—7 | 23,000 | 15,796 | 32,191 | EGdW |
| Hammond, Ind. | 64,560 | 13,760 | MC | 9—4 | 11- -38—9 | 32,000 | 25,000 | 37,769 | W |
| Hamtramck, Mich. | 56,268 | 1,340 | MC | 5—2 | 4-1-36—5 | 15,500 | 10,041 | 28,277 | None |
| Harrisburg, Pa. | 80,339 | 3,962 | Com | 5—4 | 11-12-35—3 | 36,943 | 27,464 | 54,871 | W |
| Haverhill, Mass. | 48,710 | 21,184 | Com | 5—2 | 12-3-35—2 | 21,710 | 17,280 | 31,895 | W |
| Hazelton, Pa. | 36,765 | 3,827 | MC | 4—4 | 11-5-35—2 | .... | .... | 20,206 | None |
| Highland Park, Mich. | 52,959 | 1,895 | MC | 4—2 | 4-1-35—3 | 32,869 | 8,697 | 36,244 | None |
| High Point, N. C. | 36,745 | 6,240 | Mgr | 9—2 | 5-7-35—9 | 10,500 | 8,360 | 20,166 | EdWAb |
| Hoboken, N. J. | 59,261 | 830 | Com | 5—4 | 5-12-35—5 | 24,404 | 19,764 | 37,616 | None |
| Holyoke, Mass. | 56,537 | 13,568 | MC | 21—2* | 12-3-35—14 | 26,269 | 22,252 | 35,843 | EGW |
| Huntington, W. Va. | 75,572 | 10,377 | MC | 13—2 | 11- -36—13 | 44,000 | 30,000 | 44,892 | M |
| Irvington, N. J. | 56,733 | 2,000 | Com | 5—4 | 5-10-38—5 | 24,334 | 16,992 | 37,815 | None |
| Jackson, Mich. | 55,187 | 6,560 | Mgr | 9—2 | 11-5-35—9 | 23,772 | 10,938 | 36,259 | WA |
| Jackson, Miss. | 48,282 | 10,524 | Com | 3—4 | 8- -36—3 | 10,000 | .... | 31,275 | WA |
| Jamestown, N. Y. | 45,155 | 6,077 | MC | 12—2 | 11-5-35—12 | 13,545 | 12,987 | 30,095 | EWM |
| Johnstown, Pa. | 66,993 | 3,489 | MC | 5—4 | 11- -35—5 | .... | .... | 37,043 | .... |
| Joliet, Ill. | 42,993 | 3,370 | Com | 4—4 | 4-16-35—4 | 20,000 | 19,400 | 27,654 | WA |
| Joplin, Mo. | 33,454 | 9,062 | Com | 5—4 | 4- -36—2 | 15,000 | 8,826 | 21,302 | M |
| Kalamazoo, Mich. | 54,786 | 5,600 | Mgr | 7—2 | 11-5-35—7 | 23,000 | 10,566 | 36,512 | EWMA |
| Kearny, N. J. | 40,716 | 5,680 | MC | 8—2 | 11-5-35—4 | 18,630 | 14,389 | 25,573 | W |
| Kenosha, Wis. | 50,262 | 4,742 | Mgr | 7—2 | 4-2-35—3 | 21,005 | 8,729 | 30,057 | W |
| Kokomo, Ind. | 32,843 | 3,399 | MC | 7—4 | 11-5-38—7 | 18,544 | 13,325 | 20,160 | .... |
| La Crosse, Wis. | 39,614 | 6,365 | MC | 21—4 | 4-2-35—11 | 19,000 | 11,600 | 25,531 | W |
| Lakewood, Ohio | 70,509 | 3,567 | MC | 7—4 | 11-5-35—4 | 28,749 | 20,908 | 47,767 | None |
| Lancaster, Pa. | 59,949 | 2,091 | Com | 4—4 | 11- -35—2 | 22,780 | 18,720 | 39,206 | WMA |
| Lansing, Mich. | 78,397 | 7,434 | MC | 16—2 | 11-5-35—8 | 35,000 | 20,622 | 49,963 | EWM |
| Laredo, Tex. | 32,618 | 9,161 | MC | 8—2 | 4- -36—8 | 5,000 | 4,000 | 17,676 | None |
| Lawrence, Mass. | 85,068 | 4,288 | Com | 5—2 | 12- -35—3 | 35,730 | 28,238 | 51,642 | WAb |
| Lewiston, Me. | 34,948 | 22,100 | MC | 7—1 | 2-4-35—7 | 13,606 | 7,264 | 21,177 | EW |
| Lexington, Ky. | 45,736 | 3,390 | Mgr | 5—2 | 11-5-35—5 | 15,600 | 13,785 | 31,140 | MA |
| Lima, Ohio | 42,287 | 5,120 | MC | 7—2 | 11-12-35—7 | 22,000 | 13,000 | 26,910 | WA |
| Lincoln, Neb. | 75,933 | 15,681 | Com | 5—2 | 5-5-35—5 | 38,000 | 18,227 | 49,231 | EWA |
| Little Rock, Ark. | 81,679 | 11,360 | MC | 18—2 | 4-2-35—9 | 13,000 | .... | 54,038 | A |
| Lorain, Ohio | 44,512 | 6,335 | MC | 11—2 | 11-5-35—11 | 17,000 | 12,000 | 25,790 | W |
| Lynchburg, Va. | 40,661 | 8,320 | Mgr | 7—4 | 6- -36—4 | 12,000 | 3,500 | 24,165 | WM |

TABLE III.—GOVERNMENTAL DATA FOR THE CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued

| | | | | CITY COUNCIL | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| City | Population 1930 | Land Area in Acres | Form of Government | Number of Councilmen and Term of Years | Next Election and Number to be Elected | Number Registered Voters | Number Voted Last Council Election | Population over 21 in 1930 | Utilities Owned and Operated |
| ***30,000 to 100,000—continued*** | | | | | | | | | |
| McKeesport, Pa. | 54,632 | 2,865 | MC | 5—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 17,000 | 15,000 | 31,501 | W |
| Macon, Ga. | 53,829 | 5,166 | MC | 12—2 | 11- -35—12 | 3,815 | 210 | 32,721 | W |
| Madison, Wis. | 57,899 | 5,316 | MC | 20—2 | 4-2-35—10 | 38,923 | 19,148 | 38,163 | W |
| Malden, Mass. | 58,036 | 3,264 | MC | 28—2 | 12-10-35—28 | 23,245 | 15,645 | 36,958 | W |
| Manchester, N. H. | 76,834 | 20,519 | MC | 13—2 | 11-5-35—13 | 31,449 | 25,052 | 47,277 | A |
| Mansfield, Ohio | 33,525 | 3,897 | MC | 9—2 | 11-5-35—9 | 13,000 | 11,000 | 22,239 | WA |
| Marion, Ohio | 31,084 | 3,525 | MC | 9—2 | 11-5-35—9 | 14,907 | 10,500 | 19,252 | A |
| Medford, Mass. | 59,714 | 5,248 | MC | 21—2 | 12- -35—21 | 27,169 | 21,663 | 37,238 | None |
| Meriden, Conn. | 38,481 | 14,720 | MC | 20—2 | 12-3-35—10 | 18,273 | 16,398 | 23,811 | WAAb |
| Meridian, Miss. | 31,954 | 2,526 | Com | 3—4 | 36—3 | 4,982 | 4,172 | 19,525 | W |
| Mobile, Ala. | 68,202 | 9,532 | Com | 3—5 | 11- -36—1 | .... | .... | 43,331 | .... |
| Moline, Ill. | 32,236 | 4,359 | MC | 14—2 | 4-16-35—14 | .... | 5,319 | 21,816 | W |
| Montclair, N. J. | 42,017 | 3,938 | Com | 5—4 | 5-12-36—5 | 20,700 | 12,462 | 28,058 | W |
| Montgomery, Ala. | 66,079 | 13,017 | Com | 5—4 | 5- -35—5 | 12,000 | .... | 40,509 | W |
| Mt. Vernon, N. Y. | 61,499 | 2,644 | MC | 5—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 19,536 | .... | 40,429 | W |
| Muncie, Ind. | 46,548 | 6,310 | MC | 9—4 | 11- -38—9 | 29,000 | 19,000 | 29,832 | None |
| Muskegon, Mich. | 41,390 | 5,620 | Mgr | 7—4 | 11- -36—3 | .... | .... | 25,540 | .... |
| Muskogee, Okla. | 32,026 | 5,476 | Mgr | 17—4 | 4- -36—9 | 10,000 | 6,325 | 19,891 | WA |
| Nashua, N. H. | 31,463 | 20,519 | MC | 15—4* | 11- -35—12 | 14,175 | 11,181 | 19,276 | A |
| Newark, Ohio | 30,596 | 3,951 | MC | 9—2 | 11-5-35—10 | 13,886 | 11,328 | 20,135 | W |
| New Britain, Conn. | 68,128 | 8,519 | MC | 30—2 | 4-9-35—15 | 23,479 | 16,910 | 38,885 | WAb |
| New Brunswick, N. J. | 34,555 | 3,478 | Com | 5—4 | 5-14-35—5 | 15,000 | 13,000 | 20,808 | WMAb |
| Newburgh, N. Y. | 31,275 | 2,348 | Mgr | 5—4 | 11-4-35—2 | 14,000 | 10,872 | 20,904 | W |
| New Castle, Pa. | 48,674 | 5,172 | MC | 5—4 | 11-6-35—3 | 14,000 | 13,000 | 28,268 | None |
| Newport News, Va. | 34,417 | 2,240 | Mgr | 5—4 | 6-9-36—3 | 4,500 | 1,367 | 21,228 | WP |
| New Rochelle, N. Y. | 54,000 | 6,357 | Mgr | 5—4 | 11-5-35—3 | 16,312 | 14,000 | 35,651 | None |
| Newton, Mass. | 65,276 | 11,456 | MC | 21—1* | 12-10-35—21 | 33,000 | .... | 42,919 | W |
| Niagara Falls, N. Y. | 75,460 | 8,108 | Mgr | 5—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 23,000 | 18,828 | 44,923 | WMA |
| Norristown, Pa. | 35,853 | 2,265 | MC | 12—4 | 11-5-35—6 | 14,000 | 7,500 | 23,188 | M |
| Norwalk, Conn. | 36,019 | 14,477 | MC | 9—2 | 10-7-35—9 | 16,500 | 9,918 | 23,146 | EW |
| Norwood, Ohio | 33,411 | 2,031 | MC | 9—2 | 11- -35—9 | 19,000 | 14,000 | 23,095 | W |
| Oak Park, Ill. | 63,982 | 2,880 | MC | 7—2 | 4-2-35—6 | 27,250 | 16,000 | 45,072 | W |
| Ogden, Utah | 40,272 | 10,566 | Com | 3—4 | 11- -36—1 | 20,000 | 15,219 | 22,549 | WA |
| Orange, N. J. | 35,399 | 1,414 | Com | 5—4 | 5-17-38— | 16,664 | 12,389 | 22,144 | W |
| Oshkosh, Wis. | 40,108 | 4,842 | MC | 32—2 | 4-4-35—32 | 18,500 | 14,000 | 25,687 | W |
| Paducah, Ky. | 33,541 | 5,733 | Mgr | 5—2 | 11- -35—5 | 14,983 | 8,855 | 21,094 | WMA |
| Pasadena, Calif. | 76,086 | 12,565 | Mgr | 7—4 | 4-4-35—4 | 40,000 | 14,809 | 55,983 | EW |
| Passaic, N. J. | 62,959 | 2,002 | Com | 5—4 | 5-14-35—5 | 22,836 | 17,000 | 36,930 | W |
| Pawtucket, R. I. | 77,149 | 5,467 | MC | 24—2 | 11-3-36—24 | 35,377 | 32,079 | 47,699 | W |
| Pensacola, Fla. | 31,579 | 4,960 | Mgr | 10—2 | 6-4-35—10 | 7,000 | 3,554 | 19,107 | WA |
| Perth Amboy, N. J. | 43,516 | 2,958 | Com | 5—4 | 5- -38—5 | 1,600 | 1,300 | 23,980 | EW |
| Phoenix, Ariz. | 48,118 | 4,112 | Mgr | 5—2 | 3-2-35—2 | 15,267 | 12,673 | 31,301 | WSA |
| Pittsfield, Mass. | 49,677 | 26,048 | MC | 11—2 | 11-5-35—11 | 20,565 | 17,640 | 31,117 | W |
| Plainfield, N. J. | 34,422 | 3,784 | MC | 11—2 | 11- -35—7 | 15,000 | 8,000 | 21,901 | None |
| Pontiac, Mich. | 64,928 | 12,584 | Mgr | 7—3 | 4-1-35—2 | 24,000 | 5,016 | 41,783 | WMA |
| Port Arthur, Tex. | 50,902 | 4,147 | Mgr | 7—2 | 3-12-35—3 | 16,269 | 6,608 | 30,052 | W |
| Port Huron, Mich. | 31,361 | 4,682 | Com | 5—2 | 11- -35—3 | 14,863 | 7,231 | 19,311 | W |
| Portland, Me. | 70,810 | 13,808 | Mgr | 5—5 | 12-2-35—1* | 30,000 | 9,020 | 46,835 | None |
| Portsmouth, Ohio | 42,560 | 6,918 | Mgr | 5—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 16,000 | 12,000 | 25,773 | WA |
| Portsmouth, Va. | 45,704 | 3,200 | Mgr | 7—4 | 6- -36—4 | 6,500 | 4,500 | 28,314 | WM |
| Poughkeepsie, N. Y. | 40,288 | 3,061 | MC | 17—2 | 11-3-35—17 | .... | .... | 26,422 | W |
| Pueblo, Colo. | 50,096 | 6,800 | Com | 3—4 | 11-5-35—1 | 10,900 | 10,900 | 32,103 | WA |
| Quincy, Ill. | 39,241 | 4,233 | MC | 14—2 | 4-2-35—14 | 18,308 | 5,752 | 26,569 | WMA |
| Quincy, Mass. | 71,983 | 10,560 | MC | 9—2 | 12-3-35—6 | 36,000 | 29,000 | 45,540 | W |
| Racine, Wis. | 67,542 | 5,523 | MC | 15—2 | 4-2-35—8 | 26,000 | 13,000 | 42,075 | WM |
| Raleigh, N. C. | 37,379 | 4,622 | Com | 3—2 | 5-6-35—3 | 21,000 | 11,800 | 23,178 | WMAAb |
| Revere, Mass. | 35,680 | 3,776 | MC | 9—2 | 12- -36—9 | 15,028 | 14,000 | 20,299 | W |

TABLE III.—GOVERNMENTAL DATA FOR THE CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued

| City | Population 1930 | Land Area in Acres | Form of Government | CITY COUNCIL | | Number Registered Voters | Number Voted Last Council Election | Population over 21 in 1930 | Utilities Owned and Operated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Number of Councilmen and Term of Years | Next Election and Number to be Elected | | | | |
| ***30,000 to 100,000—continued*** | | | | | | | | | |
| Richmond, Ind. | 32,493 | 3,707 | MC | 7—4 | 11- -38—7 | .... | .... | 21,186 | EM |
| Roanoke, Va. | 69,206 | 6,400 | Mgr | 5—4 | 6- -36—2 | 11,500 | 5,554 | 41,483 | M |
| Rockford, Ill. | 85,864 | 7,511 | MC | 16—2 | 4-2-35—16 | 31,628 | 24,497 | 56,585 | WM |
| Rock Island, Ill. | 37,953 | 5,947 | MC | 14—2 | 4-16-35—14 | .... | 13,153 | 25,471 | W |
| Rome, N. Y. | 32,338 | 44,800 | MC | 7—2 | 11- -35—8 | 10,207 | .... | 19,231 | W |
| Sacramento, Calif. | 93,750 | 8,771 | Mgr | 9—2 | 11-5-35—9 | 42,000 | 17,000 | 65,203 | WPMA |
| Saginaw, Mich. | 80,715 | 10,368 | Com | 5—4 | 4-1-35—3 | 33,562 | 20,800 | 49,640 | WA |
| St. Joseph, Mo. | 80,835 | 9,007 | MC | 5—4 | 4-14-36—2 | 32,000 | 23,520 | 54,890 | MA |
| St. Petersburg, Fla. | 40,425 | 33,651 | Mgr | 7—4 | 5- -35—4 | 9,800 | 4,575 | 28,327 | EdGWPSA |
| Salem, Mass. | 43,353 | 5,120 | MC | 11—2 | 12-3-35—11 | 19,701 | 15,090 | 26,976 | W |
| San Bernardino, Calif. | 37,481 | 11,565 | MC | 5—4 | 4-8-35—2 | 17,000 | 10,228 | 23,489 | W |
| San Jose, Calif. | 57,651 | 4,961 | Mgr | 7—6 | 5-4-36—3 | 28,341 | 11,978 | 38,989 | None |
| Santa Ana, Calif. | 30,322 | 6,730 | MC | 5—4 | 4- -38—5 | 18,720 | 7,500 | 20,360 | W |
| Santa Barbara, Calif. | 33,613 | 9,852 | MC | 6—2 | 5-7-35—6 | 18,000 | 7,244 | 22,925 | W |
| Santa Monica, Calif. | 37,146 | 7,040 | Com | 3—4 | 12-3-35—1 | 23,146 | 13,636 | 26,155 | WPA |
| Savannah, Ga. | 85,024 | 4,873 | MC | 12—2 | 1-8-37—12 | 14,773 | 1,635 | 54,605 | WPMAAb |
| Schenectady, N. Y. | 95,692 | 6,624 | MC* | 15—2 | 11- -35—15 | 37,898 | 35,570 | 63,080 | W |
| Sheboygan, Wis. | 39,251 | 3,206 | MC | 16—2 | 4-2-35—8 | 18,000 | 12,000 | 24,180 | WP |
| Shreveport, La. | 76,655 | 11,990 | Com | 5—4 | 11- -38—5 | 12,500 | 10,144 | 49,067 | W |
| Sioux City, Iowa | 79,183 | 28,800 | Com | 5—2 | 3- -36—5 | 41,599 | 27,731 | 49,615 | W |
| Sioux Falls, S. D. | 33,362 | 7,112 | Com | 3—5 | 4- -36—1 | .... | 14,088 | 20,992 | EW |
| Springfield, Ill. | 71,864 | 6,679 | Com | 5—4 | 4-2-35—5 | 36,489 | 29,984 | 47,474 | EW |
| Springfield, Mo. | 57,527 | 8,706 | Com | 5—4 | 4- -36—3 | .... | 12,324 | 36,313 | A |
| Springfield, Ohio | 68,743 | 7,230 | Mgr | 5—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 26,848 | 21,599 | 44,400 | W |
| Stamford, Conn. | 46,346 | 4,464 | MC | 7—2 | 10-1-36—7 | 19,667 | 14,361 | 27,811 | None |
| Steubenville, Ohio | 35,422 | 3,360 | MC | 10—2 | 11-12-35—10 | 14,000 | 7,159 | 21,630 | WAb |
| Stockton, Calif. | 47,963 | 5,823 | Mgr | 9—4 | 10-8-35—5 | 18,922 | 9,257 | 34,096 | PA |
| Superior, Wis. | 36,113 | 23,400 | MC | 10—2 | 4-2-35—5 | 16,500 | 14,500 | 22,083 | None |
| Taunton, Mass. | 37,355 | 30,272 | MC | 9—2 | 12-10-35—9 | 15,891 | 10,526 | 23,323 | EW |
| Terre Haute, Ind. | 62,810 | 5,969 | MC | 9—4 | 11- -38—9 | 41,444 | 25,427 | 41,671 | A |
| Topeka, Kans. | 64,120 | 7,241 | Com | 5—2 | 4-2-35—5 | 38,160 | 21,225 | 42,217 | WA |
| Troy, N. Y. | 72,763 | 5,964 | MC | 17—2 | 11-5-35—17 | 35,699 | 35,000 | 49,843 | WMA |
| Tucson, Ariz. | 32,506 | 4,672 | Mgr | 6—2 | 4-2-35—3 | 10,000 | 3,343 | 19,870 | WA |
| Union City, N. J. | 58,659 | 830 | Com | 5—4 | 5- -38—5 | 28,379 | 23,019 | 38,492 | None |
| Waco, Tex. | 52,848 | 8,000 | Mgr | 5—2 | 4-2-35—2 | 13,081 | 7,259 | 32,678 | WA |
| Waltham, Mass. | 39,247 | 7,936 | MC | 11—2 | 11-5-35—11 | 16,644 | 14,063 | 24,451 | W |
| Warren, Ohio | 41,062 | 5,500 | MC | 11—2 | 11-5-35—11 | .... | .... | 24,979 | W |
| Waterbury, Conn. | 99 | 17,981 | MC | 15—2 | 10-8-35—15 | 38,243 | 30,845 | 64,756 | WA |
| Waterloo, Iowa | 46,191 | 8,287 | MC | 6—2 | 3- -36—6 | 20,000 | 10,067 | 29,133 | W |
| Watertown, Mass. | 34,913 | 2,624 | TM | 3—3 | 3- -35—1 | 14,394 | 8,855 | 22,142 | W |
| Watertown, N. Y. | 32,205 | 5,434 | Mgr | 5—4 | 11-5-35—3 | 9,670 | 8,657 | 21,218 | EWA |
| Waukegan, Ill. | 33,499 | 6,145 | MC | 14—2 | 4-16-34—14 | 12,000 | 8,900 | 21,290 | W |
| West Allis, Wis. | 34,671 | 2,355 | MC | 8—4 | 4-7-36—8 | 15,024 | 10,128 | 20,405 | W |
| West New York, N. J. | 37,107 | 694 | Com | 5—4 | 5-14-35—5 | 13,847 | 10,087 | 23,136 | .... |
| Wheeling, W. Va. | 61,659 | 5,760 | MC | 12—2 | 5-23-35—12 | 34,994 | 24,111 | 38,992 | W |
| White Plains, N. Y. | 35,830 | 6,400 | MC | 6—2 | 11-5-35—2 | .... | .... | 24,128 | .... |
| Wichita Falls, Tex. | 43,690 | 6,842 | Mgr | 7—2 | 4-2-35—3 | .... | .... | 26,631 | W |
| Wilkes-Barre, Pa. | 86,626 | 4,447 | Com | 7—4 | 11-5-35—3 | 43,000 | .... | 48,696 | A |
| Williamsport, Pa. | 45,729 | 5,626 | Com | 5—4 | 11- -35—3 | 13,038 | 11,735 | 29,066 | None |
| Wilmington, N. C. | 32,270 | 3,534 | Com | 3—4 | 5- -37—3 | 9,000 | 5,500 | 18,891 | WM |
| Winston-Salem, N. C. | 75,274 | 9,529 | MC | 8—2 | 5-7-35—8 | .... | 506 | 43,432 | WM |
| Woonsocket, R. I. | 49,276 | 5,532 | MC | 20—2 | 11-3-36—20 | .... | .... | 29,068 | W |
| York, Pa. | 55,254 | 2,632 | MC | 5—4 | 11- -35—2 | 18,000 | 15,000 | 35,781 | None |
| Zanesville, Ohio | 36,440 | 4,334 | MC | 7—4 | 11-5-35—3 | 17,728 | 14,995 | 23,470 | WMA |
| ***10,000 to 30,000*** | | | | | | | | | |
| Aberdeen, S. D. | 16,465 | 2,140 | Com | 5—5 | 4-16-35—1 | 11,000 | 5,461 | 9,871 | WA |
| Aberdeen, Wash. | 21,723 | 5,176 | MC | 12—2 | 11-9-35—6 | 6,651 | 3,594 | 14,320 | .... |

TABLE III.—GOVERNMENTAL DATA FOR THE CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued

| | | | | CITY COUNCIL | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| City | Population 1930 | Land Area in Acres | Form of Government | Number of Councilmen and Term of Years | Next Election and Number to be Elected | Number Registered Voters | Number Voted Last Council Election | Population over 21 in 1930 | Utilities Owned and Operated |
| *10,000 to 30,000—continued* | | | | | | | | | |
| Abilene, Tex. | 23,175 | 5,299 | Com | 5—2 | 4-2-35—5 | 5,006 | 3,600 | 13,985 | WA |
| Ada, Okla. | 11,261 | 1,530 | Com | 3—2 | 3-19-36—3 | 4,000 | .... | 6,474 | W |
| Adams, Mass. | 12,697 | 14,720 | TM | 10—1 | 4- -35—10 | 5,350 | .... | 7,403 | W |
| Adrian, Mich. | 13,064 | 2,880 | Com | 3—2 | 4-1-35—3 | 6,856 | 4,837 | 8,531 | W |
| Albany, Ga. | 14,507 | 2,500 | Mgr | ..... | .... | .... | .... | 8,946 | .... |
| Albert Lea, Minn. | 10,169 | 1,371 | Mgr | 7—4* | 11- -36—3 | 5,537 | 4,183 | 6,390 | W |
| Albuquerque, N. Mex. | 26,570 | 8,616 | Mgr | 5—4 | 4- -36—1 | 18,000 | 6,402 | 16,223 | W |
| Alexandria, La. | 23,025 | 2,208 | Com | 3—4 | 11- -36—3 | 5,000 | 4,200 | 13,731 | EGdWPMA |
| Alexandria, Va. | 24,149 | 4,800 | Mgr | 9—2* | 6-9-36—6 | 6,000 | 3,500 | 14,707 | None |
| Alhambra, Calif. | 29,472 | 4,060 | Mgr | 5—4 | 6- -35—2 | 20,105 | 7,352 | 20,596 | W |
| Aliquippa, Pa. | 27,116 | 2,625 | MC | 7—4 | 11-5-35—4 | 10,000 | .... | 14,476 | W |
| Alliance, Ohio | 23,047 | 2,870 | MC | 8—2 | 11-12-35—8 | 11,000 | 6,172 | 14,702 | WA |
| Alpena, Mich. | 12,166 | 4,900 | Mgr | 5—4 | 4-1-36—2 | 5,100 | 2,085 | 6,831 | EW |
| Ambridge, Pa. | 20,227 | 650 | Mgr | 12—4 | 11- -35—6 | .... | .... | 10,448 | W |
| Ames, Iowa | 10,261 | 3,166 | Mgr | 6—2 | 3-30-36—6 | 6,523 | 2,632 | 6,668 | EW |
| Amesbury, Mass. | 11,899 | 8,128 | TM | 3—1 | 3-11-35—3 | 5,094 | 3,863 | 7,344 | W |
| Anaconda, Mont. | 12,494 | 803 | MC | 12—2 | 5- -35—6 | 5,635 | .... | 7,640 | None |
| Anaheim, Calif. | 10,995 | 2,464 | MC | 5—4 | 4- -36—2 | 4,800 | 3,806 | 7,140 | EW |
| Anderson, S. C. | 14,383 | 2,547 | MC | 7—2 | 6- -36—7 | 3,300 | 2,500 | 7,957 | AAb |
| Annapolis, Md. | 12,531 | 685 | MC | 10—2 | 7-9-35—10 | 7,000 | 4,000 | 7,816 | WM |
| Ann Arbor, Mich. | 26,944 | 3,592 | MC | 15—2 | 4- -36—8 | 13,867 | 8,594 | 18,896 | WMA |
| Anniston, Ala. | 22,345 | 5,435 | MC | 13—4 | 5- -36—13 | 3,469 | 1,838 | 12,660 | A |
| Ansonia, Conn. | 19,898 | 3,860 | MC | 15—2 | 11- -36—15 | 7,901 | 7,177 | 11,532 | None |
| Appleton, Wis. | 25,267 | 3,758 | MC | 12—2 | 4-2-35—6 | 12,000 | 8,800 | 15,920 | W |
| Ardmore, Okla. | 15,751 | 2,466 | Mgr | 5—4 | 4-2-35—3 | 4,000 | 2,432 | 9,471 | WA |
| Arkansas City, Kans. | 13,946 | 2,098 | Mgr | 3—2* | 4-2-35—2 | 5,168 | 2,790 | 8,661 | W |
| Arnold, Pa. | 10,575 | 150 | MC | 7—4 | 1- -36—3 | 8,000 | .... | 5,326 | None |
| Asbury Park, N. J. | 14,981 | 921 | Mgr | 5—4 | 5- -38—5 | 7,000 | .... | 10,244 | W |
| Ashland, Ky. | 29,074 | 4,821 | Mgr | 5—2 | 11-5-35—5 | 12,000 | 8,839 | 16,459 | W |
| Ashland, Ohio | 11,141 | 2,980 | MC | 5—2 | 11-5-35—5 | 4,000 | 3,200 | 7,428 | WA |
| Ashland, Wis. | 10,622 | 8,153 | MC | 20—2 | 4-2-35—20 | 5,000 | 4,703 | 6,444 | PMA |
| Ashtabula, Ohio | 23,301 | 4,198 | Mgr | 7—2 | 11- -35—7 | 10,267 | 6,944 | 14,283 | SA |
| Astoria, Ore. | 10,349 | 3,465 | Mgr | 5—4 | 11- -36—2 | 5,278 | 3,302 | 7,067 | W |
| Atchison, Kans. | 13,024 | 1,773 | Mgr | 3—2* | 4-2-35—2 | 7,789 | 3,987 | 8,558 | M |
| Athens, Ga. | 18,192 | 6,083 | MC | 10—2 | 12-4-35—5 | 1,300 | 600 | 10,512 | WA |
| Athol, Mass. | 10,677 | 20,672 | TM | ..... | 2-4-35— | 4,361 | 2,875 | 6,645 | W |
| Attleboro, Mass. | 21,769 | 17,600 | MC | 11—2 | 12- -36—11 | 9,325 | 7,619 | 13,540 | W |
| Auburn, Me. | 18,571 | 31,360 | Mgr | 5—2 | 12-11-35—5 | 8,283 | 4,447 | 12,114 | WA |
| Augusta, Me. | 17,198 | 36,160 | MC | 32—2 | 12- -36—32 | 7,700 | 6,207 | 11,158 | WA |
| Austin, Minn. | 12,276 | 1,800 | MC | 7—2 | 4- -36—7 | 6,500 | 4,957 | 7,534 | EWA |
| Bakersfield, Calif. | 26,015 | 4,470 | Mgr | 7—2 | 4-9-35—7 | 11,000 | 7,000 | 16,848 | None |
| Bangor, Me. | 28,749 | 20,662 | Mgr | 9—3 | 12-2-35—3 | 13,036 | 7,167 | 19,204 | EW |
| Barberton, Ohio | 23,934 | 3,392 | MC | 8—2 | 11-5-35—8 | 7,930 | 5,449 | 13,740 | W |
| Barre, Vt. | 11,307 | 2,285 | MC | 6—2 | 3-5-35—3 | 4,288 | 3,330 | 7,100 | W |
| Bartlesville, Okla. | 14,763 | 1,304 | Mgr | 5—2 | 4-2-35—5 | 6,000 | 2,927 | 9,269 | None |
| Batavia, N. Y. | 17,375 | 3,683 | MC | 6—2 | 11-5-35—6 | 6,638 | 6,549 | 10,748 | W |
| Beacon, N. Y. | 11,933 | 3,113 | Com | 5—4 | 11-2-37—5 | 4,000 | 3,500 | 8,078 | W |
| Beatrice, Neb. | 10,297 | 3,359 | Com | 3—2 | 4- -36—3 | 5,037 | 2,800 | 6,584 | .... |
| Beaver Falls, Pa. | 17,147 | 1,411 | MC | 4—4 | 11- -35—2 | 4,000 | 3,000 | 10,193 | None |
| Bedford, Ind. | 13,208 | 1,753 | MC | 7—4 | 11- -38—7 | 8,000 | 5,500 | 8,006 | W |
| Bellaire, Ohio | 13,327 | 1,240 | MC | 7—2 | 11-5-35—7 | 5,367 | 4,024 | 7,754 | W |
| Belleville, Ill. | 28,425 | 3,900 | MC | 14—2 | 4-2-35—14 | 13,000 | 7,400 | 18,699 | None |
| Belleville, N. J. | 26,974 | 2,115 | MC | 5—2 | 4-2-35—3 | 11,000 | 9,500 | 15,901 | None |
| Bellevue, Pa. | 10,252 | 640 | MC | 9—4 | 11-12-35—4 | 6,000 | 3,000 | 6,989 | None |
| Belmont, Mass. | 21,748 | 2,944 | TM | 3— | 11- -35—1 | 11,561 | .... | 14,498 | EW |
| Beloit, Wis. | 23,611 | 3,066 | Mgr | 5—2 | 4-2-35—3 | 11,000 | 9,500 | 15,363 | None |
| Benton Harbor, Mich. | 15,434 | 1,835 | Mgr | 9—1* | 4- -35—7 | 8,000 | 5,000 | 9,876 | WAM |

TABLE III.—GOVERNMENTAL DATA FOR THE CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued

| City | Population 1930 | Land Area in Acres | Form of Government | CITY COUNCIL | | Number Registered Voters | Number Voted Last Council Election | Population over 21 in 1930 | Utilities Owned and Operated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Number of Councilmen and Term of Years | Next Election and Number to be Elected | | | | |
| ***10,000 to 30,000—continued*** | | | | | | | | | |
| Berlin, N. H. | 20,018 | 30,975 | MC | 12—3 | 3-12-35—4 | 10,000 | 5,476 | 10,869 | W |
| Berwick, Pa. | 12,660 | 1,700 | MC | 8—4 | 9- -35—4 | 6,219 | .... | 6,990 | None |
| Bessemer, Ala. | 20,721 | 2,940 | MC | 11—4 | 5- -36—11 | 2,100 | 1,800 | 12,482 | None |
| Beverly, Mass. | 25,086 | 9,664 | MC | 9—1 | 11- -35—9 | 12,000 | 8,500 | 16,124 | WA |
| Beverly Hills, Calif. | 17,429 | 3,336 | MC | 5—4 | 4-13-36—3 | 9,700 | 4,252 | 12,754 | W |
| Biddeford, Me. | 17,633 | 18,800 | MC | 11—1 | 11- -35—11 | 7,400 | 6,610 | 10,301 | None |
| Big Spring, Tex. | 13,735 | 3,000 | Mgr | 5—2 | 4-2-35—2 | 2,000 | 1,255 | 8,166 | WAb |
| Billings, Mont. | 16,380 | 1,861 | MC | 8—2 | 4-1-35—4 | 7,636 | 582 | 10,350 | WA |
| Biloxi, Miss. | 14,850 | 3,837 | Com | 3—4 | 38—3 | 2,800 | 2,150 | 8,343 | WA |
| Bismarck, N. D. | 11,090 | 5,400 | Com | 5—4 | 4-2-35—2 | 5,000 | 3,500 | 6,354 | WA |
| Bloomington, Ind. | 18,227 | 2,349 | MC | 7—4 | 11-1-38—7 | 12,000 | 8,600 | 11,083 | W |
| Bluefield, W. Va. | 19,339 | 3,680 | Mgr | 5—4 | 7-6-37—5 | 11,398 | 5,100 | 11,000 | None |
| Blue Island, Ill. | 16,534 | 2,230 | MC | 14—2 | 4-16-35—14 | 7,000 | 6,000 | 9,993 | W |
| Blytheville, Ark. | 10,098 | 1,000 | MC | 6—2 | 4- -35—3 | 1,000 | 800 | 6,023 | A |
| Bogalusa, La. | 14,029 | 5,533 | Com | 5—4 | 12- -38—5 | 2,897 | 2,804 | 7,890 | WA |
| Boise, Idaho | 21,544 | 3,288 | MC | 4—4 | 4-2-35—2 | .... | 7,335 | 14,111 | A |
| Boone, Iowa | 11,886 | 3,350 | MC | 7—2 | 3-25-35—7 | 6,300 | 3,201 | 7,780 | W |
| Boulder, Colo. | 11,223 | 1,750 | Mgr | 9—6 | 11-5-35—3 | 6,000 | 3,496 | 7,643 | W |
| Bowling Green, Ky. | 12,348 | 2,304 | MC | 12—2 | 11- -35—12 | .... | .... | 7,871 | W |
| Braddock, Pa. | 19,329 | 340 | MC | 12—4 | 11-5-35—6 | 8,500 | 5,300 | 10,471 | W |
| Bradford, Pa. | 19,306 | 1,725 | Com | 5—4 | 11-5-35—3 | 4,000 | 3,686 | 12,327 | W |
| Brainerd, Minn. | 10,221 | 4,100 | MC | 10—4 | 4-2-35—5 | .... | 4,827 | 6,027 | EWA |
| Braintree, Mass. | 15,712 | 8,768 | TM | 3—. | 3-4-35— | 8,556 | .... | 9,728 | EW |
| Brawley, Calif. | 10,439 | 1,156 | MC | 5—4 | 4- -36—3 | 2,200 | 1,363 | 5,951 | EW |
| Bremerton, Wash. | 10,170 | 999 | Com | 3—3 | 12- -36—3 | 5,400 | 3,414 | 6,681 | WP |
| Bridgeton, N. J. | 15,699 | 3,840 | MC | 7—3 | 11- -35—3 | 9,151 | 7,055 | 10,335 | W |
| Bristol, Conn. | 28,451 | 16,000 | MC | 6—2 | 10-7-35—6 | 10,075 | 7,916 | 16,486 | W |
| Bristol, Pa. | 11,799 | 855 | MC | 18— | 11- -35— | .... | .... | 6,447 | .... |
| Bristol, R. I. | 11,953 | 6,182 | MC | 5—2 | 3- -35—5 | 4,236 | 4,000 | 6,604 | W |
| Bristol, Tenn. | 12,005 | 2,249 | Com | 3—4 | 6- -37—3 | 2,800 | 2,151 | 6,996 | W |
| Brookfield, Ill. | 10,035 | 1,905 | MC | 7—2 | 4-16-35—7 | 4,375 | 4,200 | 6,084 | .... |
| Brownsville, Tex. | 22,021 | 3,640 | Mgr | 5—2 | 12- -35—5 | 4,000 | .... | 12,245 | EWM |
| Brownwood, Tex. | 12,789 | 2,662 | Mgr | 4—2 | 4-3-35—2 | 3,500 | 2,800 | 7,777 | WA |
| Brunswick, Ga. | 14,022 | 5,995 | Mgr | 5—3 | 12-3-35—1 | 1,258 | 690 | 8,375 | None |
| Bucyrus, Ohio | 10,027 | 1,976 | MC | 7—2 | 8- -35—7 | .... | .... | 6,701 | WA |
| Burbank, Calif. | 16,662 | 10,419 | Mgr | 5—4 | 4-2-35—2 | 9,500 | 4,270 | 10,571 | EW |
| Burlingame, Calif. | 13,270 | 1,489 | MC | 5—4 | 4-3-36—3 | 7,200 | 3,200 | 9,033 | W |
| Burlington, Iowa | 26,755 | 7,151 | Com | 5—2 | 3- -36—5 | 13,000 | 9,500 | 18,116 | PMA |
| Burlington, N. J. | 10,844 | 1,407 | MC | 12—3 | 11-5-35—4 | 5,500 | 3,600 | 6,515 | W |
| Burlington, Vt. | 24,789 | 6,890 | MC | 12—2 | 3- -35—6 | 12,000 | .... | 15,227 | EWA |
| Butler, Pa. | 23,568 | 1,576 | MC | 7—2 | 8- -35—7 | .... | .... | 13,798 | WA |
| Cairo, Ill. | 13,532 | 1,440 | Com | 5—4 | 4- -35—5 | 6,900 | 5,800 | 8,938 | None |
| Calumet City, Ill. | 12,298 | .... | MC | 10—2 | 4-16-35—10 | 5,070 | 4,041 | 6,754 | W |
| Cambridge, Ohio | 16,129 | 1,800 | MC | 7—2 | 11-5-35—7 | 6,689 | 4,938 | 10,006 | W |
| Campbell, Ohio | 14,673 | 1,690 | MC | 7—2 | 11-5-35—7 | 4,200 | 3,800 | 7,077 | W |
| Canonsburg, Pa. | 12,558 | 770 | MC | 6—2 | 11- -35—3 | .... | .... | 6,421 | .... |
| Canton, Ill. | 11,718 | 1,003 | MC | 14—2 | 4-16-35—14 | 3,400 | 3,291 | 7,465 | W |
| Cape Girardeau, Mo. | 16,227 | 4,594 | Com | 4—2 | 4- -36—4 | 8,000 | 5,043 | 9,630 | None |
| Carbondale, Pa. | 20,061 | 2,150 | Com | 5—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 8,000 | 8,000 | 11,567 | None |
| Carlisle, Pa. | 12,596 | 1,609 | Mgr | 15—4 | 11- -35—7 | .... | .... | 8,188 | WM |
| Carnegie, Pa. | 12,497 | 582 | MC | 6—4 | 11- -35—3 | 5,000 | 3,500 | 6,902 | None |
| Carteret, N. J. | 13,339 | 2,970 | MC | 6—2 | 11-5-35—3 | 3,500 | 3,147 | 7,264 | None |
| Casper, Wyo. | 16,619 | 2,862 | MC | 6—2 | 11-5-35—3 | 6,672 | 5,921 | 10,483 | W |
| Central Falls, R. I. | 25,898 | 742 | MC | 16—2 | 11- -36—16 | 10,262 | 8,399 | 14,991 | None |
| Centralia, Ill. | 12,583 | 2,080 | Com | 5—4 | 4-16-35—5 | 5,500 | 4,351 | 7,887 | W |
| Chambersburg, Pa. | 13,788 | 2,237 | MC | 10—4 | 9- -35—5 | .... | .... | 8,706 | EWM |
| Champaign, Ill. | 20,348 | 2,927 | Com | 5—4 | 4-16-35—5 | 10,000 | 7,961 | 13,663 | None |

TABLE III.—GOVERNMENTAL DATA FOR THE CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued

| City | Population 1930 | Land Area in Acres | Form of Government | CITY COUNCIL |  | Number Registered Voters | Number Voted Last Council Election | Population over 21 in 1930 | Utilities Owned and Operated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  | Number of Councilmen and Term of Years | Next Election and Number to be Elected |  |  |  |  |
| ***10,000 to 30,000—continued*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chanute, Kans. | 10,277 | 1,632 | Com | 3—3 | 3-5-35—1 | 5,000 | 3,200 | 6,525 | EGWA |
| Charleroi, Pa. | 11,260 | 600 | MC | 7—4 | 11- -35—3 | 4,600 | 3,300 | 6,432 | None |
| Charlottesville, Va. | 15,245 | 2,560 | Mgr | 5—4 | 6- -35—3 | 1,400 | 800 | 9,222 | GW |
| Cheyenne, Wyo. | 17,361 | 3,893 | Com | 3—2 | 11-5-35—3 | 6,600 | 6,595 | 10,947 | WA |
| Chicago Hgts., Ill. | 22,321 | 3,460 | Com | 5—4 | 4-6-35—5 | 9,500 | 7,885 | 12,676 | W |
| Chickasha, Okla. | 14,099 | 2,289 | MC | 8—2 | 4- -35—4 | 4,500 | 1,263 | 8,488 | W |
| Chillicothe, Ohio | 18,340 | 2,314 | MC | 8—2 | 11-7-35—8 | 10,000 | 7,500 | 11,609 | None |
| Clairton, Pa. | 15,291 | 1,728 | MC | 5—4 | 11- -35—2 | 4,410 | 3,491 | 8,025 | None |
| Claremont, N. H. | 12,377 | 23,900 | TM | 3—3 | 3-14-36—1 | 5,600 | 3,806 | 7,575 | WA |
| Clarksburg, W. Va. | 28,866 | 2,830 | Mgr | 9—2 | 4-16-35—9 | 16,431 | 11,097 | 17,234 | W |
| Clarksdale, Miss. | 10,043 | 1,465 | Com | 3—4 | 12- -36—3 | 1,400 | 1,350 | 6,681 | EWA |
| Cleburne, Tex. | 11,539 | 2,240 | MC | 4—2 | 4-2-35—2 | 3,000 | 1,900 | 6,996 | W |
| Cliffside Park, N. J. | 15,267 | 596 | MC | 6—3 | 11-5-35—2 | 6,786 | 5,740 | 9,572 | None |
| Clinton, Iowa | 25,726 | 6,165 | MC | 9—2 | 3-30-36—9 | 14,000 | 10,985 | 16,844 | None |
| Clinton, Mass. | 12,817 | 3,456 | TM | 3—3 | 3-5-36—1 | 5,842 | 4,978 | 7,935 | W |
| Coatesville, Pa. | 14,582 | 923 | MC | 4—4 | 11-5-35—3 | 2,728 | 1,363 | 8,764 | W |
| Coffeyville, Kans. | 16,198 | 2,208 | Com | 4—2 | 4-2-35—4 | 6,518 | 5,663 | 10,016 | EWPA |
| Cohoes, N. Y. | 23,226 | 2,308 | MC | 6—2 | 11-5-35—6 | 11,500 | 10,600 | 14,708 | W |
| Collingswood, N. J. | 12,723 | 1,257 | Com | 3—4 | 5- -37—3 | 8,473 | 5,226 | 8,927 | W |
| Columbia, Mo. | 14,967 | 3,681 | MC | 8—2 | 4-2-35—4 | .... | .... | 9,784 | EWA |
| Columbia, Pa. | 11,349 | 945 | MC | 9—4 | 11-5-35—4 | .... | .... | 7,002 | None |
| Columbus, Miss. | 10,743 | 1,855 | MC | 6—2 | 12- -36—6 | 1,800 | 1,500 | 6,587 | WAb |
| Compton, Calif. | 12,516 | 2,900 | Mgr | 5—4 | 6-4-35—2 | 6,800 | 4,200 | 7,818 | None |
| Concord, N. H. | 25,228 | 41,001 | MC | 15—3* | 11-5-35—12 | 14,417 | 6,637 | 17,584 | W |
| Concord, N. C. | 11,820 | 2,488 | MC | 6—2 | 5-7-35—6 | 4,400 | 126 | 6,402 | EW |
| Connellsville, Pa. | 13,290 | 1,169 | MC | 5—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 4,000 | 3,043 | 7,877 | None |
| Connersville, Ind. | 12,795 | 1,875 | MC | 7—4 | 11- -38—7 | 7,500 | 6,200 | 8,194 | None |
| Conshohocken, Pa. | 10,815 | 640 | MC | 15—4 | 1-6-36—7 | 4,500 | 3,800 | 5,938 | None |
| Coraopolis, Pa. | 10,724 | 1,000 | MC | 8—4 | 11-5-35—4 | 3,800 | 2,945 | 6,196 | W |
| Corning, N. Y. | 15,777 | 1,792 | MC | 16—4 | 11-5-35—8 | 6,125 | 5,740 | 9,919 | W |
| Corpus Christi, Tex. | 27,741 | 3,333 | MC | 5—2 | 4-2-35—5 | 6,000 | 4,728 | 15,977 | GdWA |
| Corsicana, Tex. | 15,202 | 2,260 | Com | 5—2 | 4-2-35—3 | .... | .... | 9,390 | W |
| Cortland, N. Y. | 15,043 | 2,475 | MC | 6—2 | 11-5-35—6 | 5,398 | 4,661 | 10,136 | W |
| Coshocton, Ohio | 10,908 | 2,240 | MC | 7—2 | 11-5-35—7 | 4,500 | 4,310 | 7,055 | W |
| Crawfordsville, Ind. | 10,355 | 2,239 | MC | 7—4 | 1-11-39—7 | .... | .... | 6,904 | E |
| Cudahy, Wis. | 10,631 | 1,217 | MC | 8—2 | 4- -36—8 | 4,000 | 3,800 | 5,885 | W |
| Cumberland, R. I. | 10,304 | 16,800 | MC | 5—2 | 11- -36—5 | .... | .... | 6,129 | W |
| Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio | 19,797 | 5,321 | MC | 8—2 | 11-5-35—8 | .... | .... | 12,129 | EdW |
| Danbury, Conn. | 22,261 | 3,170 | MC | 12—2 | 3-25-35—6 | 10,527 | 8,324 | 14,248 | W |
| Danvers, Mass. | 12,957 | 8,704 | TM | 3—3 | 4-4-35—32 | 5,600 | .... | 8,817 | EW |
| Danville, Va. | 22,247 | 3,840 | MC | 9—4 | 6- -36—4 | 6,000 | 4,000 | 13,265 | EWGMA |
| Daytona Beach, Fla. | 16,598 | 8,282 | Mgr | 5—2 | 12-2-35—5 | .... | .... | 11,175 | WPA |
| Decatur, Ala. | 15,593 | 4,240 | MC | 5—4 | 9-21-36—5 | 3,600 | 2,533 | 9,174 | A |
| Decatur, Ga. | 13,276 | 2,240 | Mgr | 5—2 | 12-5-35—2 | 3,200 | 2,064 | 8,181 | W |
| Dedham, Mass. | 15,136 | 6,720 | TM | 3—1 | 4-4-35—3 | 7,089 | 3,920 | 9,282 | None |
| Del Rio, Tex. | 11,693 | 5,740 | MC | 3—2 | 4-2-36—3 | 1,964 | 1,600 | 6,236 | WA |
| Denison, Tex. | 13,850 | 2,260 | MC | 3—2 | 2-5-35—1 | 3,400 | 1,800 | 8,777 | W |
| Derby, Conn. | 10,788 | 3,300 | MC | 6—2 | 11-3-36—6 | 4,520 | 3,664 | 6,012 | None |
| Dickson City, Pa. | 12,395 | 1,920 | MC | 9—4 | 11-5-35—6 | .... | .... | 5,754 | None |
| Dodge City, Kans. | 10,059 | 1,034 | Com | 3—3 | 4-2-35—1 | 5,000 | 760 | 6,257 | W |
| Donora, Pa. | 13,905 | 665 | MC | 7—4 | 11-5-35—3 | 3,700 | 1,900 | 6,983 | None |
| Dormont, Pa. | 13,190 | 620 | MC | 7—4 | 11-5-35—3 | 8,500 | 4,200 | 9,102 | None |
| Dothan, Ala. | 16,046 | 6,040 | MC | 9—4 | 4- -36—9 | 2,100 | 2,000 | 8,507 | EWA |
| Dover, N. H. | 13,573 | 16,877 | MC | 25—2 | 12-3-35—25 | 8,000 | 5,599 | 8,735 | W |
| Dover, N. J. | 10,031 | 1,600 | TM | 9—2 | 11-5-35—5 | 6,000 | 4,800 | 6,542 | W |
| Du Bois, Pa. | 11,595 | 1,874 | MC | 5—4 | 11-5-35—3 | 3,200 | 2,300 | 6,655 | WA |
| Dunkirk, N. Y. | 17,802 | 3,000 | MC | 5—2 | 11-5-35—5 | 6,523 | .... | 10,509 | EW |

Table III.—Governmental Data for the Cities Over 10,000—Continued

*10,000 to 30,000—continued*

| City | Population 1930 | Land Area in Acres | Form of Government | CITY COUNCIL | | Number Registered Voters | Number Voted Last Council Election | Population over 21 in 1930 | Utilities Owned and Operated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Number of Councilmen and Term of Years | Next Election and Number to be Elected | | | | |
| Dunmore, Pa. | 22,627 | 5,218 | MC | 6—4 | 11- -35—3 | 12,000 | 9,500 | 12,098 | None |
| Duquesne, Pa. | 21,396 | 1,260 | MC | 4—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 4,879 | 4,561 | 11,361 | W |
| Easthampton, Mass. | 11,323 | 8,512 | TM | 3—1 | 3-11-35—3 | 4,470 | 3,400 | 6,451 | W |
| East Hartford, Conn. | 17,125 | 11,547 | MC | 16—2 | 10-7-35—16 | 7,281 | 4,849 | 10,270 | W |
| East Liverpool, Ohio | 23,329 | 2,086 | MC | 8—2 | 11-5-35—8 | 7,500 | 6,800 | 14,305 | W |
| East Moline, Ill. | 10,107 | 2,188 | MC | 10—2 | 4-16-35—10 | 3,500 | 3,300 | 6,190 | W |
| E. Providence, R. I. | 29,995 | 8,640 | MC | 5—2 | 11-3-36—5 | 12,145 | 5,486 | 18,042 | W |
| Eau Claire, Wis. | 26,287 | 9,231 | Com | 3—6 | 4- -36—1 | 10,100 | 8,300 | 16,483 | W |
| Ecorse, Mich. | 12,716 | 1,384 | MC | 6—2 | 3-11-35—3 | 5,000 | 3,100 | 6,731 | None |
| El Dorado, Ark. | 16,421 | 2,560 | MC | 8—2 | 12- -35—4 | 2,500 | 2,000 | 10,101 | None |
| El Dorado, Kans. | 10,311 | 1,280 | Mgr | 3—4* | 4-2-35—2 | 4,129 | 2,490 | 6,285 | WA |
| Elizabeth City, N. C. | 10,037 | 1,440 | Mgr | 8—2 | 5-14-35—8 | 2,200 | 1,700 | 5,734 | EWPMA |
| Ellwood City, Pa. | 12,323 | 1,204 | Mgr | 10—4 | 11-5-35—5 | 5,500 | 2,500 | 6,560 | Ed |
| Elmhurst, Ill. | 14,055 | 5,120 | MC | 10—2 | 4-16-35—10 | .... | 7,000 | 8,863 | W |
| Elmwood Park, Ill. | 11,270 | 1,200 | MC | 6—2 | 4-16-35—6 | 5,000 | 4,129 | 6,435 | None |
| Elwood, Ind. | 10,685 | 1,687 | MC | 7—4 | 11- -38—7 | 7,500 | 6,200 | 6,536 | None |
| Elyria, Ohio | 25,633 | 4,467 | MC | 9—2 | 11-12-35—9 | 9,214 | 7,777 | 16,499 | W |
| Emporia, Kans. | 14,067 | 1,679 | Com | 3—3 | 4-2-35—1 | 6,000 | 5,136 | 8,991 | W |
| Endicott, N. Y. | 16,231 | 1,167 | MC | 6—2 | 3- -35—4 | 5,896 | 2,033 | 9,818 | EA |
| Englewood, N. J. | 17,805 | 3,190 | MC | 5—3 | 11-5-35—3 | 8,282 | 6,743 | 11,790 | None |
| Enid, Okla. | 26,399 | 4,845 | MC | 3—2 | 4-2-35—3 | 10,000 | 6,000 | 16,528 | WA |
| Escanaba, Mich. | 14,524 | 5,102 | Mgr | 5—4 | 4- -36—3 | 6,700 | 2,625 | 8,401 | EdGWA |
| Euclid, Ohio | 12,751 | 7,210 | MC | 7—2 | 11-5-35—7 | 6,900 | 5,868 | 7,434 | None |
| Eugene, Ore. | 18,901 | 3,030 | MC | 8—4 | 11- -36—4 | 7,986 | 7,079 | 12,545 | EWA |
| Eureka, Calif. | 15,752 | 3,731 | MC | 5—2 | 6-17-35—5 | 9,892 | 6,256 | 10,806 | WS |
| Fairfield, Ala. | 11,059 | 860 | MC | 11—4 | 7- -36—11 | 1,000 | 890 | 6,437 | None |
| Fairhaven, Mass. | 10,951 | 7,808 | TM | 3— | .... | .... | .... | 6,623 | .... |
| Fairmont, W. Va. | 23,159 | 2,720 | Com | 4—4 | 6-11-35—4 | 12,567 | .... | 14,030 | W |
| Fargo, N. D. | 28,619 | 3,203 | Com | 5—4 | 4-2-35—2 | 14,500 | 6,595 | 18,006 | WMA |
| Faribault, Minn. | 12,767 | 5,734 | Com | 5—2 | 4-2-35—5 | 5,678 | 3,518 | 7,739 | W |
| Farrell, Pa. | 14,359 | 1,142 | MC | 4—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 4,900 | 4,300 | 7,209 | None |
| Fayetteville, N. C. | 13,049 | 3,200 | MC | 8—2 | 5- -35—8 | .... | .... | 7,400 | EWAAb |
| Ferndale, Mich. | 20,855 | 2,393 | Mgr | 5—4 | 4-1-35—3 | 5,933 | 4,496 | 11,649 | WM |
| Findlay, Ohio | 19,363 | 5,170 | MC | 8—2 | 11-5-35—8 | 11,000 | 9,000 | 12,811 | WA |
| Floral Park, N. Y. | 10,016 | 890 | MC | 5—2 | 3-19-35—3 | 3,500 | 3,233 | 6,744 | None |
| Florence, Ala. | 11,729 | 3,640 | Com | 3—3 | 5-16-35—1 | .... | .... | 6,657 | .... |
| Florence, S. C. | 14,774 | 2,011 | Mgr | 4—4 | 5-7-35—2 | 2,000 | 1,100 | 8,204 | WA |
| Fond du Lac, Wis. | 26,449 | 3,800 | Com | 3—6 | 4-2-35—1 | 12,633 | 9,372 | 16,866 | W |
| Forest Park, Ill. | 14,555 | 1,600 | Com | 5—4 | 4-17-35—5 | 6,700 | 6,152 | 9,428 | W |
| Fort Collins, Colo. | 11,489 | 1,758 | Com | 3—6 | 4- -36—1 | 7,700 | 2,408 | 7,194 | WSA |
| Fort Dodge, Iowa | 21,895 | 3,290 | Com | 3—2 | 3-25-35—3 | 10,871 | 6,373 | 13,526 | WMA |
| Fort Madison, Iowa | 13,779 | 3,840 | MC | 7—2 | 3-25-35—7 | 7,000 | 3,883 | 9,269 | None |
| Fort Scott, Kans. | 10,763 | 2,576 | Com | 3—2 | 4-2-35—3 | 6,100 | 4,700 | 6,880 | WA |
| Fort Thomas, Ky. | 10,008 | 3,280 | MC | 6—2 | 11- -35—6 | 4,000 | 2,800 | 6,819 | None |
| Fostoria, Ohio | 12,790 | 1,938 | MC | 7—2 | 11-7-35—7 | 5,000 | 4,700 | 8,122 | W |
| Framingham, Mass. | 22,210 | 15,872 | TM | 3—3 | 3- -36—1 | 6,383 | 6,125 | 13,841 | None |
| Frankfort, Ind. | 12,196 | 1,740 | MC | 7—4 | 11-8-38—7 | 8,000 | 7,200 | 7,959 | E |
| Frankfort, Ky. | 11,626 | 1,047 | MC | 12—2 | 11- -35—12 | .... | .... | 8,116 | None |
| Franklin, Pa. | 10,254 | 1,319 | MC | 5—4 | 11- -35—2 | 4,781 | 3,969 | 6,567 | W |
| Frederick, Md. | 14,434 | 1,760 | MC | 5—3 | 6- -37—5 | 7,099 | 4,700 | 9,261 | EWMA |
| Freeport, Ill. | 22,045 | 2,508 | MC | 10—2 | 4-2-35—10 | 12,400 | 4,932 | 14,633 | None |
| Freeport, N. Y. | 15,467 | 2,735 | MC | 5—2 | 3-19-35—3 | 8,405 | 6,650 | 10,467 | EWP |
| Fremont, Neb. | 11,407 | 1,926 | MC | 8—2 | 4-3-35—4 | 6,139 | 1,968 | 7,420 | EW |
| Fremont, Ohio | 13,422 | 2,454 | MC | 8—2 | 11-5-35—8 | .... | .... | 8,748 | W |
| Fullerton, Calif. | 10,860 | 10,613 | MC | 5—4 | 4- -36—3 | 5,000 | 2,268 | 6,915 | W |
| Fulton, N. Y. | 12,462 | 2,252 | MC | 6—2 | 11-5-35—6 | 4,800 | 4,652 | 7,722 | WA |
| Gadsden, Ala. | 24,042 | 8,085 | Com | 3—4 | 5- -38—3 | 4,000 | 3,809 | 13,654 | W |

Table III.—Governmental Data for the Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Population 1930 | Land Area in Acres | Form of Government | City Council | | Number Registered Voters | Number Voted Last Council Election | Population over 21 in 1930 | Utilities Owned and Operated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Number of Councilmen and Term of Years | Next Election and Number to be Elected | | | | |
| ***10,000 to 30,000—continued*** | | | | | | | | | |
| Gainesville, Fla. | 10,465 | 3,520 | Mgr | 5—3 | 9- -35—1 | 1,990 | 1,421 | 6,582 | EWA |
| Galesburg, Ill. | 28,830 | 5,760 | MC | 14—2 | 2-12-35—14 | 16,424 | 12,246 | 19,498 | WA |
| Gardner, Mass. | 19,399 | 14,080 | MC | 11—2 | 12-3-35—5 | 7,237 | 5,918 | 12,110 | WA |
| Garfield, N. J. | 29,739 | 1,298 | MC | 8—2 | 11- -35—4 | 11,000 | 7,200 | 15,549 | W |
| Garfield Hgts., Ohio | 15,589 | 4,160 | MC | 8—2 | 11-5-35—8 | 6,956 | 6,160 | 8,998 | None |
| Gastonia, N. C. | 17,093 | 2,880 | Mgr | 5—2 | .... | .... | .... | 8,967 | .... |
| Geneva, N. Y. | 16,053 | 2,416 | MC | 13—2 | 11-5-35—13 | 7,030 | 6,387 | 10,264 | W |
| Glen Cove, N. Y. | 11,430 | 4,266 | MC | 5—2 | 11-5-35—5 | 5,105 | 4,910 | 6,730 | None |
| Glens Falls, N. Y. | 18,531 | 2,352 | MC | 6—2 | 11-5-35—6 | .... | .... | 12,686 | W |
| Gloucester, Mass. | 24,204 | 16,768 | MC | 5—1 | 12-3-35—5 | 11,084 | 8,636 | 15,541 | W |
| Gloucester, N. J. | 13,796 | 1,974 | MC | 9—3 | 11-13-35—3 | 8,302 | 6,060 | 8,406 | W |
| Gloversville, N. Y. | 23,099 | 2,737 | MC | 12—2 | 11- -35—12 | 8,725 | 8,275 | 15,882 | W |
| Goldsboro, N. C. | 14,985 | 1,940 | Mgr | 5—2 | 5- -35—5 | 3,600 | 2,200 | 8,235 | WA |
| Goshen, Ind. | 10,397 | 2,300 | MC | 7—4 | 11- -38—7 | 5,200 | 4,886 | 6,812 | EWA |
| Grand Forks, N. D. | 17,112 | 2,313 | Com | 5—4 | 4-7-36—2 | 10,000 | 6,915 | 10,358 | WA |
| Grand Island, Neb. | 18,041 | 3,671 | MC | 8—2 | 4-2-36—4 | 7,100 | 5,200 | 11,454 | EWA |
| Grand Junction, Colo. | 10,247 | 1,210 | Mgr | 7—4 | 4-2-35—3 | 3,922 | 1,600 | 6,291 | WA |
| Granite City, Ill. | 25,130 | 2,720 | MC | 14—2 | 4-2-35—14 | .... | 6,915 | 14,634 | None |
| Great Falls, Mont. | 28,822 | 4,958 | MC | 10—2 | 3-18-35—5 | 12,300 | 3,134 | 18,341 | WAM |
| Greeley, Colo. | 12,203 | 2,265 | MC | 6—2 | 4-2-35—6 | 8,103 | 4,392 | 7,660 | W |
| Greenfield, Mass. | 15,500 | 13,760 | TM | 3—1 | 3-4-35—3 | 8,051 | 4,462 | 10,022 | W |
| Greensburg, Pa. | 16,508 | 1,065 | MC | 4—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 4,961 | 3,814 | 10,121 | None |
| Greenville, Miss. | 14,807 | 1,600 | MC | 6—4 | 12- -35—3 | 2,300 | 1,500 | 9,778 | WPAAb |
| Greenville, S. C. | 29,154 | 3,121 | MC | 6—2 | 8- -35—6 | 3,000 | 2,400 | 17,453 | WA |
| Greenville, Tex. | 12,407 | 2,458 | Com | 3—2 | 4-2-36—3 | .... | .... | 7,570 | EW |
| Greenwood, Miss. | 11,123 | 1,304 | Com | 3—4 | 12- -38—3 | 1,410 | 949 | 7,185 | EW |
| Greenwood, S. C. | 11,020 | 2,350 | MC | 6—2 | 7- -35—6 | 2,500 | 2,250 | 6,036 | W |
| Griffin, Ga. | 10,321 | 2,112 | Mgr | 3—2 | 12-2-36—3 | 1,833 | 952 | 6,012 | EW |
| Gr. Pte. Park, Mich. | 11,174 | 1,408 | Com | 6—2 | 3-11-35—3 | 5,000 | 2,185 | 7,217 | None |
| Gulfport, Miss. | 12,547 | 7,680 | Com | 3—4 | 12- -36—3 | 3,000 | 1,575 | 7,688 | WPA |
| Hackensack, N. J. | 24,568 | 2,944 | Mgr | 5—4 | 5- -37—5 | 11,710 | 4,140 | 15,749 | None |
| Hannibal, Mo. | 22,761 | 3,453 | MC | 12—4 | 5-7-35—6 | 10,670 | 7,043 | 14,620 | EWPMAb |
| Hanover, Pa. | 11,805 | 2,000 | Mgr | 10—4 | 11- -35—5 | 7,000 | 4,320 | 7,494 | WM |
| Harlingen, Tex. | 12,124 | 1,239 | Com | 5—2 | 12-10-35—3 | .... | 1,141 | 7,004 | None |
| Harrisburg, Ill. | 11,625 | 1,360 | Com | 5—4 | 4-16-35—5 | 5,000 | 4,112 | 6,779 | A |
| Harrison, N. J. | 15,601 | 774 | MC | 8—2 | 11-5-35—4 | 6,321 | 5,135 | 8,564 | None |
| Harvey, Ill. | 16,374 | 2,652 | Com | 5—4 | 4-16-35—5 | 7,000 | 6,900 | 9,643 | W |
| Hastings, Neb. | 15,490 | 3,763 | MC | 8—2 | 4-2-35—4 | 7,187 | 3,052 | 9,756 | EWA |
| Hattiesburg, Miss. | 18,601 | 6,834 | Com | 3—4 | 8- -36—3 | 2,000 | 1,400 | 11,021 | WA |
| Hawthorne, N. J. | 11,868 | 1,457 | Com | 3—4 | 5-14-35—3 | 6,829 | 4,425 | 7,710 | W |
| Helena, Mont. | 11,803 | 5,707 | Com | 3—2 | 3-18-35—1 | 6,400 | 4,451 | 8,046 | WA |
| Hempstead, N. Y. | 12,650 | 1,600 | MC | 5—2 | 3-19-35—3 | .... | 4,260 | 8,570 | W |
| Henderson, Ky. | 11,668 | 2,227 | Com | 3—2 | 11- -35—2 | 6,500 | .... | 7,423 | EGW |
| Herkimer, N. Y. | 10,446 | 1,300 | MC | 5—2 | 3-19-35—3 | .... | .... | 6,416 | EW |
| Hibbing, Minn. | 15,666 | 8,511 | MC | 5—3 | 12- -35—2 | 8,654 | 7,784 | 8,706 | EGWMA |
| Highland Park, Ill. | 12,203 | 7,680 | Com | 5—4 | 4-16-35—5 | 4,500 | 4,200 | 7,948 | W |
| Holland, Mich. | 14,346 | 1,830 | MC | 12—2 | 4-1-35—6 | 6,300 | 4,700 | 8,522 | EW |
| Homestead, Pa. | 20,141 | 348 | MC | 15—4 | 9- -35—7 | 9,500 | 6,000 | 11,409 | None |
| Hopewell, Va. | 11,327 | 2,880 | Mgr | 5—4 | 6-6-36—3 | 2,000 | 1,800 | 6,253 | MA |
| Hopkinsville, Ky. | 10,746 | 1,400 | Com | 3—. | 11-5-35—. | 4,000 | 3,750 | 7,098 | EGWAb |
| Hoquiam, Wash. | 12,766 | 4,531 | MC | 12—2 | 12-7-35—6 | 4,400 | 1,929 | 8,190 | W |
| Hornell, N. Y. | 16,250 | 1,531 | MC | 12—2 | 11- -35—12 | 6,789 | 6,315 | 10,667 | W |
| Hot Springs, Ark. | 20,238 | 3,760 | MC | 16—2 | 4-2-35—8 | 12,000 | 8,000 | 13,673 | None |
| Hudson, N. Y. | 12,337 | 2,240 | MC | 10—2 | 11-5-35—10 | 2,000 | .... | 7,762 | W |
| Huntington, Ind. | 13,420 | 1,828 | MC | 7—4 | 11-6-38—7 | .... | 7,105 | 8,437 | EW |
| Huntington Pk., Calif. | 24,591 | 1,798 | MC | 5—4 | 4- -36—2 | 15,108 | 6,457 | 16,766 | W |
| Huntsville, Ala. | 11,554 | 1,280 | MC | 10—4 | 9- -36—10 | 2,253 | 1,756 | 7,119 | WAb |

TABLE III.—GOVERNMENTAL DATA FOR THE CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued

| City | Population 1930 | Land Area in Acres | Form of Government | CITY COUNCIL |  | Number Registered Voters | Number Voted Last Council Election | Population over 21 in 1930 | Utilities Owned and Operated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  | Number of Councilmen and Term of Years | Next Election and Number to be Elected |  |  |  |  |
| ***10,000 to 30,000—continued*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Huron, S. D. | 10,946 | 2,708 | Com | 5—5 | 4- -35—1 | 4,500 | 4,500 | 6,772 | W |
| Hutchinson, Kans. | 27,085 | 5,990 | Com | 5—2 | 4- -35—5 | 13,500 | 8,996 | 16,809 | P |
| Independence, Kans. | 12,782 | 1,783 | Com | 3—3 | 4-2-35—1 | 6,709 | 4,270 | 8,290 | W |
| Independence, Mo. | 15,296 | 2,140 | MC | 8—2 | 4-2-35—4 | 9,000 | 6,346 | 9,831 | E |
| Inglewood, Calif. | 19,480 | 4,518 | MC | 4—4 | 4-9-35—2 | 12,668 | 2,466 | 12,788 | W |
| Iowa City, Iowa | 15,340 | 3,391 | MC | 7—2 | 3-25-35—7 | 8,500 | 8,300 | 10,507 | A |
| Irondequoit, N. Y. | 18,024 | .... | MC | 4—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 9,000 | 8,300 | 11,435 | None |
| Iron Mountain, Mich. | 11,652 | 3,800 | MC | 10—2 | 3-4-35—10 | 6,000 | .... | 6,666 | W |
| Ironton, Ohio | 16,621 | 2,880 | Mgr | 7—4 | 11-5-35—3 | 8,000 | 4,750 | 9,986 | W |
| Ironwood, Mich. | 14,299 | 3,740 | Mgr | 5—4 | 4-1-35—2 | 6,464 | 5,126 | 7,686 | GWMA |
| Ithaca, N. Y. | 20,708 | 3,470 | MC | 10—4 | 11-2-35—5 | 6,583 | 6,095 | 14,418 | .... |
| Jackson, Tenn. | 22,172 | 2,214 | Com | 3—4 | 6-4-35—3 | 3,500 | 1,530 | 14,233 | EWA |
| Jacksonville, Ill. | 17,747 | 3,598 | MC | 8—2 | 4-16-35—8 | .... | 4,357 | 13,008 | W |
| Janesville, Wis. | 21,628 | 4,215 | Mgr | 7—2 | 4-2-35—4 | 12,000 | 2,400 | 14,275 | W |
| Jeannette, Pa. | 15,126 | 1,446 | MC | 18—4 | 11-5-35—9 | 8,000 | 5,000 | 8,266 | None |
| Jefferson City, Mo. | 21,596 | 3,648 | MC | 10—2 | 4-2-35—5 | 10,460 | 3,937 | 14,620 | None |
| Jeffersonville, Ind. | 11,946 | 862 | MC | 7—4 | 11- -38—7 | 7,566 | 6,033 | 7,669 | None |
| Johnson City, N. Y. | 13,567 | 969 | MC | 5—2 | 3-19-35—3 | 8,000 | 3,600 | 8,433 | W |
| Johnson City, Tenn. | 25,080 | 4,773 | MC | 5—2 | 6-27-35—4 | 3,002 | 2,721 | 14,935 | W |
| Johnstown, N. Y. | 10,801 | 2,160 | MC | 5—4 | 11- -35—2 | 4,400 | 4,013 | 7,413 | W |
| Jonesboro, Ark. | 10,326 | 1,920 | MC | 10—2 | 4-2-35—7 | 3,000 | 750 | 6,226 | EWM |
| Kankakee, Ill. | 26,620 | 2,230 | MC | 14—2 | 4-16-35—14 | 10,000 | 2,100 | 13,186 | None |
| Keene, N. H. | 13,794 | 23,400 | MC | 20—2 | 11-5-35—20 | 6,221 | 2,664 | 8,948 | WA |
| Kenmore, N. Y. | 16,482 | 907 | MC | 4—2 | 3-19-35—2 | 6,000 | 3,929 | 10,935 | None |
| Keokuk, Iowa | 15,106 | 3,520 | Com | 3—2 | 3- -36—2 | 9,000 | 5,792 | 10,072 | None |
| Kewanee, Ill. | 17,093 | 3,175 | Com | 5—4 | 4-16-35—4 | 8,500 | 8,046 | 10,710 | W |
| Key West, Fla. | 12,831 | 2,040 | MC | 7—2 | 11-12-35—7 | 3,500 | 2,700 | 7,692 | W |
| Kingsport, Tenn. | 11,914 | 3,000 | Mgr | 5—4 | 6-1-35—3 | 1,300 | 762 | 6,292 | W |
| Kingston, N. Y. | 28,088 | 4,748 | MC | 13—2 | 11-5-35—13 | 15,000 | 14,000 | 19,079 | W |
| Kingston, Pa. | 21,600 | 1,438 | MC | 14—4 | 11- -35—3 | 11,175 | 4,250 | 12,929 | None |
| Kinston, N. C. | 11,362 | 922 | MC | 5—2 | 4-2-35—5 | 2,100 | 2,052 | 6,510 | EW |
| Klamath Falls, Ore. | 16,093 | 2,950 | MC | 5—2 | 11- -36—5 | 8,500 | 5,422 | 10,704 | None |
| Lackawanna, N. Y. | 23,948 | 3,918 | MC | 4—2 | 11-5-35—4 | 7,300 | 6,693 | 12,076 | None |
| Laconia, N. H. | 12,471 | 13,001 | MC | 6—1 | 3- -35—6 | 7,173 | 5,034 | 7,811 | None |
| Lafayette, Ind. | 26,240 | 3,098 | MC | 7—4 | 11-6-38—7 | 17,120 | 14,032 | 17,037 | W |
| Lafayette, La. | 14,635 | .... | Com | 3—4 | 2- -36—3 | 5,000 | 4,000 | 7,944 | EWA |
| Lagrange, Ga. | 20,131 | 8,045 | MC | 6—2 | 10- -35—3 | 3,500 | 2,500 | 10,618 | EGWA |
| La Grange, Ill. | 10,103 | 1,220 | MC | 7—2 | 4-16-35—7 | 2,500 | 1,877 | 6,535 | None |
| Lake Charles, La. | 15,791 | 3,200 | Com | 3—4 | 2- -37—3 | .... | 3,119 | 9,332 | None |
| Lakeland, Fla. | 18,554 | 9,876 | Mgr | 3—3 | 12-3-35—1 | 4,021 | 2,744 | 11,448 | EWA |
| Lancaster, Ohio | 18,716 | 3,096 | MC | 8—2 | 11-5-35—8 | 7,000 | 6,300 | 11,718 | GW |
| La Porte, Ind. | 15,755 | 1,952 | MC | 7— | 11- -38—7 | 9,028 | 6,930 | 9,796 | W |
| La Salle, Ill. | 13,149 | 1,370 | MC | 15—2 | 4-16-35—15 | 5,000 | 4,658 | 7,821 | W |
| Latrobe, Pa. | 10,644 | 1,003 | MC | 12—4 | 11-12-35—6 | 7,000 | 3,000 | 6,028 | None |
| Laurel, Miss. | 18,017 | 3,545 | Com | 3—4 | 8- -36—3 | 3,000 | 1,500 | 10,243 | WA |
| Lawrence, Kans. | 13,726 | 2,769 | Com* | 3—.* | 3-5-35—12 | 8,998 | 3,092 | 9,480 | WA |
| Lawton, Okla. | 12,121 | 1,360 | MC | 8—2 | 3-19-35—4 | 4,500 | 3,400 | 7,468 | WA |
| Leavenworth, Kans. | 17,466 | 4,800 | Com | 5—2 | 4-3-35—5 | 12,703 | 8,434 | 11,592 | W |
| Lebanon, Pa. | 25,561 | 1,998 | MC | 4—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 7,000 | .... | 15,813 | W |
| Leominster, Mass. | 21,810 | 18,432 | MC | 9—2 | 12-2-35—4 | 9,262 | 5,007 | 13,265 | W |
| Lewistown, Pa. | 13,357 | 1,900 | MC | 14—4 | 11-5-35—7 | 5,000 | 2,500 | 8,245 | None |
| Lincoln, Ill. | 12,855 | 2,480 | MC | 14—2 | 4-16-35—14 | .... | 3,319 | 7,750 | None |
| Lincoln, R. I. | 10,421 | 12,525 | MC | 5—2 | 6-1-35—5 | 3,032 | 500 | 6,213 | None |
| Lincoln Park, Mich. | 12,336 | 3,791 | MC | 6— | .... | 3,600 | 3,300 | 6,530 | None |
| Linden, N. J. | 21,206 | 7,930 | MC | 9—3 | 11-5-35—4 | 8,932 | 7,314 | 11,243 | None |
| Little Falls, N. Y. | 11,105 | 2,446 | MC | 8—2 | 11- -35—8 | 4,400 | 4,400 | 6,884 | W |
| Lockport, N. Y. | 23,160 | 5,052 | MC | 10—2 | 11-5-35—10 | 9,769 | .... | 15,338 | None |

## TABLE III.—GOVERNMENTAL DATA FOR THE CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued

| City | Population 1930 | Land Area in Acres | Form of Government | CITY COUNCIL |  | Number Registered Voters | Number Voted Last Council Election | Population over 21 in 1930 | Utilities Owned and Operated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  | Number of Councilmen and Term of Years | Next Election and Number to be Elected |  |  |  |  |
| ***10,000 to 30,000—continued*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lodi, N. J. | 11,549 | 1,306 | MC | 6—3 | 11- -35—2 | 4,349 | 3,263 | 5,980 | W |
| Logansport, Ind. | 18,508 | 2,553 | MC | 7—4 | 11- -38—7 | 12,367 | 11,410 | 12,224 | EW |
| Long Branch, N. J. | 18,399 | 3,780 | Com | 5—4 | 5- -36—5 | 10,461 | 7,541 | 11,840 | None |
| Longview, Wash. | 10,652 | 5,200 | MC | 7—2* | 11-13-36—4 | 4,191 | 2,200 | 6,571 | None |
| Lubbock, Tex. | 20,520 | 3,980 | Mgr | 4—4 | 4-3-36—2 | 4,800 | 3,500 | 11,863 | EWA |
| Lynbrook, N. Y. | 11,993 | 1,600 | MC | 5—2 | 3-19-35—3 | 4,500 | 3,500 | 7,926 | None |
| McAlester, Okla. | 11,804 | 3,697 | Mgr | 8—2 | 4-15-36—7 | 4,000 | 3,000 | 6,932 | WA |
| McComb, Miss. | 10,057 | 2,700 | Com | 3—4 | 8- -38—3 | 3,000 | 2,340 | 5,977 | WAAb |
| McKees Rocks, Pa. | 18,116 | 705 | MC | 9—4 | 11-5-35—4 | 6,000 | 4,200 | 9,772 | None |
| Mahanoy City, Pa. | 14,784 | 2,104 | MC | 15—4 | 11-4-35—7 | 6,000 | 4,000 | 8,242 | None |
| Mamaroneck, N. Y. | 11,766 | 1,890 | Mgr | 5—2 | 3-19-35—3 | 4,933 | 3,178 | 7,432 | None |
| Manhattan, Kans. | 10,136 | 1,305 | Com | 3—3 | 4-2-35—1 | .... | .... | 6,659 | W |
| Manitowoc, Wis. | 22,963 | 4,700 | MC | 14—2 | 4-2-35—7 | 10,000 | 8,295 | 14,195 | EWA |
| Mankato, Minn. | 14,038 | 4,340 | MC | 4—2 | 4-2-35—4 | 7,400 | 5,200 | 9,001 | W |
| Maplewood, Mo. | 12,657 | 984 | MC | 3—2 | 4-2-35—3 | 6,000 | 3,000 | 8,368 | None |
| Marietta, Ohio | 14,285 | 2,096 | MC | 8—2 | 11-5-35—8 | 7,500 | 6,300 | 9,639 | W |
| Marinette, Wis. | 13,734 | 3,480 | MC | 10—2 | 4- -35—5 | 7,000 | 5,000 | 8,378 | None |
| Marion, Ind. | 24,496 | 3,085 | MC | 7—4 | 11-6-38—7 | 8,000 | 7,000 | 15,792 | W |
| Marlborough, Mass. | 15,587 | 13,440 | MC | 11—2 | 11- -35—11 | 7,693 | 6,575 | 10,004 | W |
| Marquette, Mich. | 14,789 | 6,585 | Com | 5—5 | 12-2-35—1 | 7,109 | 4,314 | 9,024 | EW |
| Marshall, Tex. | 16,203 | 5,750 | Mgr | 5—2 | 4-5-35—3 | 1,900 | .... | 9,637 | WA |
| Marshalltown, Iowa | 17,373 | 3,868 | MC | 8—2 | 3-25-35—8 | 8,145 | 5,341 | 11,265 | W |
| Martinsburg, W. Va. | 14,857 | 1,600 | MC | 7—2 | 6-10-36—7 | 9,000 | 5,813 | 9,238 | WMA |
| Martins Ferry, Ohio | 14,524 | 811 | MC | 7—2 | 11-12-35—7 | 6,000 | 4,600 | 8,726 | EW |
| Mason City, Iowa | 23,304 | 7,835 | Mgr | 5—3 | 3-25-35—5 | 10,500 | 5,648 | 14,253 | W |
| Massena, N. Y. | 10,637 | 2,523 | MC | 4—2 | 3-19-35—3 | 2,293 | 1,510 | 6,035 | W |
| Massillon, Ohio | 26,400 | 4,162 | MC | 10—2 | 11-5-35—10 | 8,000 | 6,000 | 16,854 | None |
| Mattoon, Ill. | 14,631 | 2,681 | MC | 14—2 | 4-16-35—14 | 8,000 | 6,700 | 9,116 | None |
| Maywood, Ill. | 25,829 | 1,664 | MC | 7—2 | 4-16-35—6 | .... | 8,400 | 16,269 | W |
| Meadville, Pa. | 16,698 | 1,451 | MC | 4—4 | 11-5-35—2 | .... | 4,089 | 10,689 | WM |
| Medford, Ore. | 11,007 | 1,920 | MC | 8—4 | 11- -36—4 | 6,626 | 2,745 | 7,267 | W |
| Melrose, Mass. | 23,170 | 3,008 | MC | 11—2 | 12-8-36—11 | 12,615 | 7,207 | 15,454 | None |
| Melrose Park, Ill. | 10,741 | 1,487 | MC | 6—2 | 4-16-35—6 | 4,000 | 3,900 | 5,832 | W |
| Menominee, Mich. | 10,320 | 2,787 | MC | 14—2 | 4-1-35—7 | 4,439 | 3,940 | 6,201 | W |
| Methuen, Mass. | 21,069 | 14,336 | TM | 3—3 | 3-4-35—1 | 10,338 | 8,046 | 12,958 | W |
| Michigan City, Ind. | 26,735 | 4,400 | MC | 7—4 | 11- -38—7 | 12,492 | 9,424 | 17,273 | W |
| Middlesborough, Ky. | 10,350 | 4,982 | Com | 3—2* | 11-6-35—2 | 4,000 | 3,500 | 5,257 | A |
| Middletown, Conn. | 24,554 | 25,413 | MC | 9—4 | 10- -36—4 | 9,974 | 6,974 | 15,488 | W |
| Middletown, N. Y. | 21,276 | 2,377 | MC | 9—2 | 11-5-35—9 | 7,258 | 6,937 | 15,842 | W |
| Middletown, Ohio | 29,992 | 3,360 | Mgr | 5—4 | 11-5-35—4 | 13,208 | 9,316 | 17,849 | W |
| Milford, Mass. | 14,741 | 9,472 | TM | 3—1 | 3-4-35—3 | 6,504 | 5,177 | 8,559 | None |
| Milton, Mass. | 16,434 | 8,384 | TM | 3—1 | 3-2-35—3 | 9,695 | 7,600 | 11,088 | None |
| Millville, N. J. | 14,705 | 34,160 | Com | 5—4 | 5- -37—5 | 8,842 | 6,596 | 9,288 | W |
| Minot, N. D. | 16,099 | 2,187 | Mgr | 14—4 | 4-1-35—7 | 7,000 | 5,722 | 9,539 | WA |
| Mishawaka, Ind. | 28,630 | 4,303 | MC | 7—4 | 11- -38—7 | .... | 9,600 | 16,983 | EdW |
| Missoula, Mont. | 14,657 | 2,760 | Com | 3—2 | 4-1-35—1 | 8,910 | 5,297 | 9,367 | None |
| Mitchell, S. D. | 10,942 | 1,955 | MC | 8—2 | 4-16-35—4 | 6,585 | 4,626 | 6,956 | WA |
| Moberly, Mo. | 13,772 | 2,085 | MC | 8—2 | 4-9-36—4 | 7,000 | 5,321 | 9,379 | W |
| Modesto, Calif. | 13,842 | 1,937 | MC | 5—4 | 4-8-35—3 | 6,718 | 4,201 | 9,137 | WA |
| Monessen, Pa. | 20,268 | 1,300 | MC | 5—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 5,500 | 5,100 | 10,073 | None |
| Monroe, La. | 26,028 | 3,086 | Com | 3—4 | 1-8-36—3 | 6,000 | 4,923 | 16,766 | EWSA |
| Monroe, Mich. | 18,110 | 3,300 | Com | 6—2 | 12-2-35—6 | 8,500 | 5,535 | 10,888 | WPA |
| Monrovia, Calif. | 10,890 | 5,184 | MC | 5—4 | 4- -36—2 | 5,725 | 2,934 | 7,454 | W |
| Morgantown, W. Va. | 16,186 | 1,807 | Mgr | 10—2 | 6-4-35—5 | 8,430 | 3,721 | 9,931 | None |
| Morristown, N. J. | 15,197 | 1,814 | MC | 9—2 | 11-5-35—4 | 9,433 | 6,629 | 10,151 | W |
| Moundsville, W. Va. | 14,411 | 1,975 | MC | 8—4 | 6-4-35—4 | .... | 4,287 | 9,015 | None |
| Mount Carmel, Pa. | 17,967 | 640 | MC | 12—4 | 11-5-35—6 | 7,500 | 5,000 | 9,466 | None |

TABLE III.—GOVERNMENTAL DATA FOR THE CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued

*10,000 to 30,000—continued*

| City | Population 1930 | Land Area in Acres | Form of Government | CITY COUNCIL | | Number Registered Voters | Number Voted Last Council Election | Population over 21 in 1930 | Utilities Owned and Operated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Number of Councilmen and Term of Years | Next Election and Number to be Elected | | | | |
| Mount Clemens, Mich. | 13,497 | 2,286 | Com | 5—2 | 4-1-35—3 | 6,675 | 4,265 | 8,297 | W |
| Mount Vernon, Ill. | 12,375 | 2,000 | MC | 10—2 | 4-16-36—10 | 5,000 | 4,500 | 7,688 | .... |
| Munhall, Pa. | 12,995 | 1,460 | MC | 7—4 | 11-5-35—3 | 5,500 | 3,169 | 7,375 | None |
| Muscatine, Iowa | 16,778 | 4,261 | MC | 8—2 | 3- -35—4 | 10,000 | 3,500 | 11,180 | EWA |
| Muskegon Hgts., Mich. | 15,584 | 1,926 | Mgr | 6—2 | 4-1-35—3 | 5,300 | 2,800 | 8,704 | W |
| Nanticoke, Pa. | 26,043 | 2,080 | MC | 5—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 9,600 | 9,000 | 13,250 | None |
| Natchez, Miss. | 13,422 | 6,578 | MC | 8—2 | .... | .... | .... | 8,493 | WA |
| Natick, Mass. | 13,589 | 9,536 | TM | .... | .... | .... | .... | 8,620 | .... |
| Naugatuck, Conn. | 14,315 | 10,630 | MC | 7—1 | 5- -35—7 | 7,200 | 4,556 | 8,870 | None |
| Needham, Mass. | 10,845 | 8,000 | TM | 3—1 | 3-11-35—3 | 5,390 | 4,020 | 6,891 | W |
| New Albany, Ind. | 25,819 | 3,250 | MC | 7—4 | 11- -38—7 | 15,000 | 12,000 | 16,773 | M |
| New Bern, N. C. | 11,981 | 960 | MC | 10—2 | 5-7-35—10 | 2,500 | 2,300 | 7,075 | EWA |
| Newburyport, Mass. | 15,084 | 5,312 | MC | 11—2 | 12-10-35—6 | 7,786 | 6,160 | 9,933 | W |
| New Castle, Ind. | 14,027 | 1,611 | MC | 7—4 | 11- -38—7 | .... | 7,132 | 8,656 | EW |
| New Kensington, Pa. | 16,762 | 2,480 | MC | 5—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 12,000 | 6,000 | 8,927 | None |
| New London, Conn. | 29,640 | 3,883 | Mgr | 7—2 | 9-9-35—3 | 9,936 | 5,286 | 18,981 | W |
| New Philadelphia, O. | 12,365 | 1,908 | MC | 7—2 | 11-12-35—7 | 4,768 | 3,600 | 7,765 | W |
| Newport, Ky. | 29,744 | 940 | Mgr | 5—2* | 11-5-35—5 | 11,242 | 11,204 | 19,442 | W |
| Newport, R. I. | 27,612 | 4,445 | MC | 20—2 | 11- -36—20 | 12,469 | 10,346 | 17,734 | None |
| Newton, Iowa | 11,560 | 2,127 | MC | 6—2 | 3-25-35—6 | 4,500 | 3,800 | 7,215 | GW |
| Newton, Kans. | 11,034 | 2,535 | Mgr | 3—4* | 4-2-35—2 | 5,301 | 2,472 | 6,899 | W |
| Niles, Mich. | 11,326 | 2,598 | MC | 8—2 | 4-1-35—4 | 5,714 | 3,116 | 7,054 | EWA |
| Niles, Ohio | 16,314 | 3,000 | MC | 7—2 | 11- -35—7 | 5,873 | 5,000 | 9,394 | EdW |
| Norfolk, Neb. | 10,717 | 1,890 | MC | 8—2 | 4-2-35—4 | 5,467 | 3,107 | 6,636 | WA |
| North Adams, Mass. | 21,621 | 13,184 | MC | 21—3 | 12-10-35—7 | 10,370 | 8,953 | 13,675 | W |
| Northampton, Mass. | 24,381 | 22,144 | MC | 28—2 | 11-3-35—28 | 10,302 | 9,322 | 16,434 | W |
| N. Attleborough, Mass. | 10,197 | 12,224 | TM | 3—1 | 4-18-35—3 | 5,000 | 3,313 | 6,664 | EW |
| N. Braddock, Pa. | 16,782 | 912 | MC | 9—4 | 11-5-35—4 | 7,700 | 5,100 | 8,782 | Ab |
| North Little Rock, Ark. | 19,418 | 2,660 | MC | 10—2 | 3-12-35—5 | 2,400 | 2,100 | 11,431 | E |
| North Platte, Neb. | 12,061 | 1,520 | MC | 8—4 | 4- -35—4 | .... | 3,009 | 7,306 | WA |
| N. Providence, R. I. | 11,104 | 3,750 | MC | 7—2 | 11- -36—7 | 5,049 | 4,414 | 6,241 | None |
| N. Tonawanda, N. Y. | 19,019 | 6,656 | MC | 7—2 | 11-5-35—7 | 6,443 | 6,185 | 10,959 | WM |
| Norwich, Conn. | 23,021 | 3,500 | MC | 12—2 | 6-3-35—6 | .... | .... | 13,834 | .... |
| Norwood, Mass. | 15,049 | 6,720 | Mgr | 5—3 | 1-19-36—2 | 6,500 | 4,127 | 9,086 | EW |
| Nutley, N. J. | 20,572 | 2,197 | Com | 5—4 | 5-12-36—5 | 10,415 | 7,205 | 12,034 | None |
| Ogdensburg, N. Y. | 16,915 | 2,976 | MC | 8—4 | 11-4-35—4 | 9,000 | 8,000 | 11,288 | WM |
| Oil City, Pa. | 22,075 | 2,596 | Com | 5—4 | 11-5-35—3 | 8,000 | 7,000 | 13,221 | WA |
| Okmulgee, Okla. | 17,097 | 1,997 | Com | 3—3 | 4-2-35—1 | 5,354 | 3,536 | 10,186 | WA |
| Old Forge, Pa. | 12,661 | 2,560 | MC | 12—4 | 9-17-35—6 | 3,800 | 3,500 | 5,773 | None |
| Olean, N. Y. | 21,790 | 3,964 | MC | 11—2 | 11-5-35—11 | 734 | 711 | 13,479 | W |
| Olympia, Wash. | 11,733 | 4,187 | Com | 3—3 | 37—3 | 6,262 | .... | 7,783 | WMA |
| Olyphant, Pa. | 10,743 | 3,340 | MC | 4—4 | 11-1-35— | .... | .... | 5,375 | E |
| Oneida, N. Y. | 10,558 | 14,350 | MC | 6—2 | 11-5-35—6 | 4,862 | 4,444 | 7,074 | W |
| Oneonta, N. Y. | 12,536 | 2,388 | MC | 6—2 | 11-5-35—6 | .... | .... | 8,481 | W |
| Ontario, Calif. | 13,583 | 7,471 | MC | 5—4 | 4-6-36—3 | 6,489 | 1,791 | 8,592 | W |
| Orlando, Fla. | 27,330 | 6,997 | Com | 4—3 | 10- -35—1 | 5,200 | 4,300 | 17,740 | EW |
| Oskaloosa, Iowa | 10,123 | 2,530 | MC | 7—2 | 3-25-35—7 | 6,000 | 4,500 | 6,806 | WM |
| Ossining, N. Y. | 15,241 | 1,927 | Com | 5—2 | 12-10-35—2 | .... | 3,251 | 10,634 | W |
| Oswego, N. Y. | 22,652 | 4,850 | MC | 8—2 | 11-5-35—8 | .... | .... | 14,315 | WM |
| Ottawa, Ill. | 15,094 | 2,380 | Com | 5—4 | 4-16-35—5 | 7,000 | 6,329 | 9,626 | W |
| Ottumwa, Iowa | 28,075 | 4,784 | Com | 3—2 | 3-25-35—3 | 14,000 | 8,714 | 17,572 | WA |
| Owensboro, Ky. | 22,765 | 2,478 | Com | 3—2 | 11- -35—2 | 10,000 | .... | 14,182 | EWA |
| Owosso, Mich. | 14,496 | 2,668 | Com | 3—3 | 4-1-35—1 | 6,500 | 2,974 | 8,621 | W |
| Painesville, Ohio | 10,944 | 3,060 | Mgr | 7—4 | 11-5-35—5 | .... | 2,994 | 7,012 | EGW |
| Palestine, Tex. | 11,445 | 2,443 | MC | 4—2 | 4-1-35—4 | 3,000 | 1,375 | 7,211 | WA |
| Palo Alto, Calif. | 13,652 | 2,208 | MC | 15—6 | 5-14-35—7 | 7,775 | 2,469 | 9,554 | EGWA |
| Pampa, Tex. | 10,470 | 1,784 | Mgr | 3—2 | 4-2-36—3 | 1,986 | 1,300 | 6,436 | W |

Table III.—Governmental Data for the Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| | | | | CITY COUNCIL | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| City | Population 1930 | Land Area in Acres | Form of Government | Number of Councilmen and Term of Years | Next Election and Number to be Elected | Number Registered Voters | Number Voted Last Council Election | Population over 21 in 1930 | Utilities Owned and Operated |
| ***10,000 to 30,000—continued*** | | | | | | | | | |
| Paris, Tex. | 15,649 | 3,123 | MC | 5—2 | 4-7-36—5 | 3,800 | .... | 9,798 | WAAb |
| Parkersburg, W. Va. | 29,623 | 3,400 | Com | 4—3 | 4- -35—4 | 17,500 | 11,500 | 18,981 | W |
| Park Ridge, Ill. | 10,417 | 3,050 | MC | 10—2 | 4-16-35—10 | .... | 5,000 | 6,564 | W |
| Parma, Ohio | 13,899 | 12,638 | MC | 7—2 | 11-5-35—7 | 5,200 | 4,700 | 7,741 | None |
| Parsons, Kans. | 14,903 | 2,540 | Com | 3—2 | 4-2-35—3 | 8,584 | 5,453 | 9,731 | WA |
| Peabody, Mass. | 21,345 | 10,496 | MC | 11—2 | 12-3-35—6 | 9,030 | 6,533 | 12,729 | EW |
| Peekskill, N. Y. | 17,125 | 2,816 | MC | 7—3 | 4-9-35—3 | .... | 3,000 | 10,296 | W |
| Pekin, Ill. | 16,129 | 4,146 | Com | 5—4 | 2-26-35—5 | 5,500 | .... | 10,149 | S |
| Peru, Ind. | 12,730 | 1,371 | MC | 7—4 | 11- -38—7 | 8,500 | 7,000 | 8,376 | EWA |
| Petersburg, Va. | 28,564 | 3,200 | Mgr | 5—4 | 6- -36—3 | 2,994 | 215 | 17,109 | WPM |
| Phenix City, Ala. | 13,862 | .... | Com | 3—3 | 9- -35—1 | 2,400 | 2,000 | 7,495 | None |
| Phillipsburg, N. J. | 19,255 | 2,044 | Com | 5—4 | 5-16-38—5 | 9,480 | 6,189 | 11,627 | A |
| Phoenixville, Pa. | 12,029 | 1,467 | Mgr | 12—4 | 11- -35—6 | 4,500 | 3,300 | 6,990 | W |
| Pine Bluff, Ark. | 20,760 | 3,200 | MC | 8—2 | 4-2-35—4 | 3,600 | 1,331 | 13,159 | None |
| Piqua, Ohio | 16,009 | 2,240 | Mgr | 5—2 | 11-5-35—5 | 7,800 | 4,000 | 10,585 | EWM |
| Pittsburg, Kans. | 18,145 | 3,110 | Com | 5—2 | 4-2-35—5 | 8,000 | 7,000 | 11,578 | WA |
| Pittston, Pa. | 18,246 | 1,069 | MC | 5—4 | 9-19-35—3 | 7,200 | 6,800 | 9,415 | None |
| Plattsburg, N. Y. | 13,349 | 2,733 | MC | 6—2 | 11-4-35—6 | .... | 4,098 | 8,545 | WA |
| Pleasantville, N. J. | 11,580 | 3,567 | MC | 7—3 | 11-5-35—2 | 6,996 | 5,153 | 7,225 | None |
| Plymouth, Mass. | 13,042 | 62,464 | TM | .... | .... | .... | .... | 8,433 | .... |
| Plymouth, Pa. | 16,543 | 691 | MC | 13—4 | 11-5-35—7 | 8,441 | 4,500 | 8,960 | None |
| Pocatello, Idaho | 16,471 | 1,961 | MC | 4—4 | 4-2-35—2 | .... | 5,373 | 9,707 | WA |
| Pomona, Calif. | 20,804 | 8,000 | MC | 5—4 | 4-1-35—3 | 11,113 | 6,840 | 13,660 | W |
| Ponca City, Okla. | 16,136 | 2,000 | Com | 3—3 | 4-2-35—1 | 5,000 | 2,200 | 9,943 | EW |
| Port Angeles, Wash. | 10,188 | 3,987 | Com | 3—3 | 12- -36—3 | 4,238 | 3,121 | 6,506 | EdW |
| Port Chester, N. Y. | 22,662 | 1,500 | MC | 6—3 | 4-23-35—2 | 8,551 | 7,265 | 13,692 | P |
| Port Jervis, N. Y. | 10,243 | 1,420 | MC | 9—2 | 11-5-35—9 | .... | 4,321 | 6,763 | W |
| Portsmouth, N. H. | 14,495 | 9,680 | MC | 9—2 | 12- -36—9 | 8,029 | 5,743 | 9,571 | WA |
| Pottstown, Pa. | 19,430 | 3,200 | MC | 20—4 | 11- -35— | .... | .... | 12,219 | None |
| Pottsville, Pa. | 24,300 | 2,285 | MC | 5—4 | 11-5-35—3 | 8,500 | .... | 14,972 | None |
| Provo, Utah | 14,766 | 8,384 | Com | 3—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 4,500 | 4,200 | 7,950 | W |
| Rahway, N. J. | 16,011 | 2,513 | MC | 11—2 | 11-5-35—5 | 7,075 | 6,200 | 10,050 | W |
| Rapid City, S. D. | 10,404 | 3,840 | Mgr | 9—3 | 4-16-35—3 | 6,041 | 2,702 | 6,356 | W |
| Red Bank, N. J. | 11,622 | 1,178 | MC | 6—2 | 11-5-35—2 | 6,500 | 4,600 | 7,660 | W |
| Redlands, Calif. | 14,177 | 10,506 | MC | 5—4 | 4- -36—2 | 6,500 | 3,318 | 9,252 | W |
| Reno, Nevada | 18,529 | 2,525 | MC | 6—4 | 5-7-35—6 | 8,563 | 6,827 | 13,609 | A |
| Rensselaer, N. Y. | 11,223 | 1,952 | MC | 10—2 | 11-5-35—10 | 7,000 | 6,097 | 7,609 | None |
| Richmond, Calif. | 20,093 | 6,848 | Mgr | 9—6 | 5-13-35—3 | 10,701 | 5,940 | 13,046 | P |
| Ridgefield Park, N. J. | 10,764 | 772 | Com | 3—4 | 5- -36—3 | 6,500 | 4,200 | 7,300 | None |
| Ridgewood, N. J. | 12,188 | 3,968 | Com | 3—4 | 5-14-35—3 | 8,353 | 4,306 | 8,320 | W |
| River Rouge, Mich. | 17,314 | 1,900 | Com | 6—2 | 4-1-35—4 | 7,194 | .... | 9,734 | None |
| Riverside, Calif. | 29,696 | 25,046 | MC | 7—4 | 36—3 | 14,954 | 5,319 | 19,184 | EW |
| Rochester, Minn. | 20,621 | 3,216 | MC | 7—2 | 3-12-35—3 | 8,582 | 4,807 | 13,933 | EW |
| Rochester, N. H. | 10,209 | 22,040 | MC | 18—3 | 12-3-35—6 | 6,000 | 3,765 | 6,507 | W |
| Rock Hill, S. C. | 11,322 | 2,500 | Mgr | 5—2 | 12-3-35—3 | 3,400 | 2,200 | 6,278 | EdWA |
| Rockville Centre, N. Y. | 13,718 | 2,244 | MC | 5—2 | 3-19-35—3 | 6,000 | 4,300 | 9,076 | EW |
| Rocky Mount, N. C. | 21,412 | 2,150 | Mgr | 12—2 | 5- -35—5 | 4,500 | 3,600 | 11,692 | EGWA |
| Rome, Ga. | 21,843 | 1,968 | Mgr | 9—4 | 11- -36—9 | 4,800 | 4,500 | 12,359 | W |
| Roselle, N. J. | 13,021 | 1,495 | MC | 6—3 | 11-5-35—2 | 6,664 | 4,579 | 7,895 | None |
| Roswell, N. M. | 11,173 | 3,475 | Mgr | 10—4 | 4-10-36—5 | 5,000 | 2,600 | 6,502 | WA |
| Royal Oak, Mich. | 22,904 | 6,970 | Mgr | 7—2 | 11-6-35—7 | 8,398 | 3,048 | 13,344 | WM |
| Rutherford, N. J. | 14,915 | 1,800 | MC | 6—3 | 11-9-35—2 | 8,000 | 6,700 | 10,413 | None |
| Rutland, Vt. | 17,315 | 5,200 | MC | 11—2 | 3-5-35—6 | 7,700 | 3,698 | 11,177 | W |
| St. Augustine, Fla. | 12,111 | 6,400 | Mgr | 5—3 | 11-5-35—2 | .... | .... | 7,641 | WPA |
| St. Charles, Mo. | 10,491 | 2,240 | MC | 8—2 | 4-2-35—4 | 4,681 | 2,357 | 6,726 | W |
| St. Cloud, Minn. | 21,000 | 5,604 | Com | 5—4 | 4-25-36—5 | 9,000 | 8,500 | 11,937 | WA |
| Salem, Ohio | 10,622 | 1,690 | MC | 8—2 | 11- -35—8 | .... | 3,500 | 6,768 | W |

TABLE III.—GOVERNMENTAL DATA FOR THE CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued

| City | Population 1930 | Land Area in Acres | Form of Government | CITY COUNCIL |  | Number Registered Voters | Number Voted Last Council Election | Population over 21 in 1930 | Utilities Owned and Operated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  | Number of Councilmen and Term of Years | Next Election and Number to be Elected |  |  |  |  |
| ***10,000 to 30,000—continued*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| em, Ore. | 26,266 | 3,553 | MC | 14—4 | 5- -36—7 | 14,161 | 7,595 | 18,780 | A |
| ina, Kans. | 20,155 | 2,944 | Mgr | 5—4* | 4- -35—3 | 11,229 | 8,326 | 12,653 | WA |
| inas, Calif. | 10,263 | 2,004 | MC | 5—4 | 6- -35—3 | 4,672 | 2,032 | 7,021 | None |
| isbury, Md. | 10,997 | 2,326 | MC | 5—2 | 5-7-35—3 | 3,476 | 2,050 | 7,139 | W |
| isbury, N. C. | 16,951 | 3,281 | Mgr | 5—2 | 5-6-35—5 | 5,800 | 3,500 | 9,646 | WAAb |
| n Angelo, Tex. | 25,308 | 4,188 | Mgr | 3—2 | 4-3-36—3 | 5,000 | 4,200 | 15,547 | Ab |
| n Benito, Tex. | 10,753 | 1,220 | Com | 5—2 | 4-2-35—2 | .... | 902 | 5,708 | AAb |
| ndusky, Ohio | 24,622 | 4,645 | Mgr | 5—4 | 11-5-35—3 | 10,319 | 9,137 | 16,131 | WA |
| nford, Fla. | 10,100 | 3,440 | Mgr | 5—3 | 12-3-35—2 | 1,900 | 117 | 6,118 | WA |
| n Leandro, Calif. | 11,455 | 2,560 | Mgr | 5—4 | 4- -36—3 | 5,000 | 3,000 | 7,230 | None |
| n Mateo, Calif. | 13,444 | 6,240 | Mgr | 5—4 | 4-2-35—2 | 7,360 | 4,000 | 9,160 | None |
| nta Cruz, Calif. | 14,395 | 5,702 | Com | 5—4 | 5-7-35—2 | 8,000 | 4,828 | 10,175 | W |
| nta Fe, N. Mex. | 11,176 | 17,361 | MC | 8—4 | 4- -36—4 | 7,500 | .... | 6,379 | None |
| nta Rosa, Calif. | 10,636 | 1,389 | Mgr | 5—4 | 4- -36—2 | 5,684 | 1,458 | 7,405 | W |
| pulpa, Okla. | 10,533 | 1,815 | Mgr | 10—2 | 4- -36—10 | .... | 2,400 | 6,273 | W |
| ratoga Springs, N. Y. | 13,169 | 20,859 | Com | 5—2 | 11- -35—5 | 8,100 | 7,600 | 9,143 | W |
| ugus, Mass. | 14,700 | 6,784 | TM | 3—1 | .... | .... | .... | 8,638 | .... |
| ult Ste. Marie, Mich. | 13,755 | 13,440 | Mgr | 5—4 | 4-1-35—1 | 6,500 | 4,574 | 8,071 | WA |
| dalia, Mo. | 20,806 | 4,380 | MC | 8—2 | 4-7-35—5 | 11,500 | 5,000 | 13,549 | None |
| ma, Ala. | 18,012 | 2,500 | MC | 11—4 | 4- -36—11 | 2,500 | 2,300 | 10,859 | WA |
| minole, Okla. | 11,459 | 434 | MC | 4—2 | 3-19-35—4 | .... | .... | 7,111 | .... |
| aker Heights, Ohio | 17,783 | 4,156 | MC | 7—4 | 11-5-35—7 | 7,977 | 2,759 | 11,729 | None |
| amokin, Pa. | 20,274 | 524 | MC | 20—4 | 11-5-36—10 | .... | .... | 11,775 | None |
| aron, Pa. | 25,908 | 2,332 | MC | 4—4 | 11-12-35—3 | 8,000 | 6,800 | 15,182 | None |
| awnee, Okla. | 23,283 | 2,280 | Mgr | 7—4 | 4- -36—4 | 11,000 | 4,379 | 14,030 | WA |
| elby, N. C. | 10,789 | 4,524 | MC | 4—2 | 5-7-35—4 | .... | .... | 5,618 | EdWAb |
| elbyville, Ind. | 10,618 | 986 | MC | 7—4 | 11- -38—7 | .... | .... | 7,066 | None |
| elton, Conn. | 10,113 | 18,969 | MC | 6—2 | 11- -36—6 | 4,899 | 3,525 | 5,775 | None |
| enandoah, Pa. | 21,782 | 1,001 | MC | 15—4 | 11-5-35— | .... | .... | 11,240 | None |
| erman, Tex. | 15,713 | 3,283 | Mgr | 15—2 | 4-2-35—9 | 4,259 | 381 | 9,877 | W |
| orewood, Wis. | 13,479 | 1,002 | Mgr | 7—2 | 4-2-35—4 | 6,300 | 3,343 | 8,855 | None |
| uthbridge, Mass. | 14,264 | 13,056 | TM | 3—1 | 3- -36—3 | .... | .... | 8,475 | .... |
| uth Gate, Calif. | 19,632 | 4,800 | MC | 5—4 | 4- -36—2 | 10,723 | 4,151 | 12,441 | W |
| uth Milwaukee, Wis. | 10,706 | 3,072 | MC | 8—2 | 4-2-35—8 | 5,500 | 3,700 | 6,237 | W |
| uth Orange, N. J. | 13,630 | 1,883 | MC | 7—2 | 4-23-35—3 | 8,138 | 560 | 9,240 | W |
| uth Pasadena, Calif. | 13,730 | 2,010 | Mgr | 5—4 | 4- -36—3 | 7,702 | 3,227 | 9,923 | W |
| uth Portland, Me. | 13,840 | 7,850 | Mgr | 5—3 | 12-2-35—2 | 6,000 | 1,471 | 8,421 | None |
| uth River, N. J. | 10,759 | 1,280 | MC | 6—3 | 11- -35—2 | 4,000 | 3,400 | 5,480 | EW |
| uth St. Paul, Minn. | 10,000 | 3,429 | MC | 7—2 | 4-2-35—7 | 4,500 | 3,600 | 5,685 | W |
| rtanburg, S. C. | 28,723 | 4,524 | Com | 5—4 | 5-14-35—2 | 4,375 | 3,157 | 16,261 | WA |
| tesville, N. C. | 10,490 | 2,048 | MC | 8—2 | 5-7-35—8 | 3,900 | 3,106 | 5,904 | EWAb |
| unton, Va. | 11,990 | 1,920 | Mgr | 5—4 | 6- -36—3 | 2,100 | 1,335 | 8,448 | EWA |
| elton, Pa. | 13,291 | 1,140 | MC | 10—4 | 11- -35—5 | 6,000 | 4,500 | 7,552 | W |
| rling, Ill. | 10,012 | 1,280 | Com | 5—4 | 4-16-35—5 | 4,000 | 3,791 | 6,656 | A |
| vens Point, Wis. | 13,623 | 12,480 | Mgr | 5—2 | 4-2-35—2 | 8,000 | 3,500 | 7,774 | W |
| neham, Mass. | 10,060 | 3,840 | TM | 3—1 | 3- -36—3 | 5,300 | 3,686 | 6,425 | W |
| atford, Conn. | 19,212 | 10,665 | Mgr | 10—2 | 10-7-35—10 | 8,987 | 4,627 | 11,314 | None |
| eator, Ill. | 14,728 | 2,076 | Com | 5—4 | 4-16-35—5 | 9,000 | 6,803 | 8,960 | None |
| uthers, Ohio | 11,249 | 1,984 | MC | 8—2 | 11-5-35—8 | 3,600 | 3,446 | 5,771 | None |
| folk, Va. | 10,271 | 1,280 | Mgr | 5—4 | 6-11-35—3 | 1,655 | 315 | 6,154 | M |
| nmit, N. J. | 14,556 | 3,817 | MC | 7—3 | 11- -35—2 | 5,200 | 3,900 | 9,433 | None |
| nter, S. C. | 11,780 | 2,011 | Mgr | 3—4 | 8- -36—2 | 4,000 | 400 | 6,526 | W |
| ibury, Pa. | 15,626 | 1,100 | MC | 4—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 6,620 | 5,378 | 10,061 | None |
| ampscott, Mass. | 10,346 | 1,984 | TM | 3—3 | 2-18-35— | 5,200 | 4,200 | 6,870 | None |
| eetwater, Tex. | 10,848 | 3,900 | Mgr | 5—2 | 4-9-35—3 | 2,500 | 900 | 6,129 | WAAb |
| ssvale, Pa. | 16,029 | 867 | MC | 7—4 | 11-12-35—3 | .... | .... | 9,664 | None |
| lahassee, Fla. | 10,700 | 2,672 | Mgr | 3—3 | 2-19-35—1 | 1,500 | 125 | 6,488 | EGWA |

TABLE III.—GOVERNMENTAL DATA FOR THE CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued

| City | Population 1930 | Land Area in Acres | Form of Government | CITY COUNCIL |  | Number Registered Voters | Number Voted Last Council Election | Population over 21 in 1930 | Utilities Owned and Operated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  | Number of Councilmen and Term of Years | Next Election and Number to be Elected |  |  |  |  |
| ***10,000 to 30,000—continued*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tamaqua, Pa. | 12,936 | 690 | MC | 12—4 | 9- -35—6 | 7,500 | 4,300 | 7,658 | W |
| Taylor, Pa. | 10,428 | 3,281 | MC | 12—4 | 11-5-35—6 | 3,000 | 2,300 | 5,107 | None |
| Temple, Tex. | 15,345 | 2,669 | Mgr | 5—2 | 4- -36—5 | .... | .... | 9,502 | WAb |
| Texarkana, Ark. | 10,764 | 1,965 | MC | 8—2 | 4 | 1,800 | 906 | 6,712 | None |
| Texarkana, Tex. | 16,602 | 1,955 | MC | 5—2 | 4-9-35—2 | 1,800 | 1,200 | 10,231 | M |
| Thomasville, Ga. | 11,733 | .... | MC | 8—2 | 1- -37—8 | 1,950 | 1,500 | 6,884 | EW |
| Thomasville, N. C. | 10,090 | 2,158 | Mgr | 5—2 | 3-7-35—5 | 600 | 250 | 4,751 | W |
| Tiffin, Ohio | 16,428 | 3,175 | MC | 7—2 | 11-5-35—7 | 8,000 | 5,345 | 9,998 | None |
| Tonawanda, N. Y. | 12,681 | 2,200 | MC | 7—2 | 11-5-35—7 | .... | .... | 8,148 | W |
| Torrington, Conn. | 26,040 | 2,327 | MC | 4—2 | 10-7-35—4 | 11,033 | 8,512 | 15,239 | None |
| Traverse City, Mich. | 12,539 | 3,662 | Com | 5—4 | 11- -36—3 | 5,200 | 3,548 | 8,715 | EW |
| Trinidad, Colo. | 11,732 | 1,860 | MC | 10—2 | 4-2-35—10 | 8,500 | 5,211 | 6,802 | W |
| Turtle Creek, Pa. | 10,690 | 409 | MC | 9—2 | 11-5-35—4 | 5,500 | 3,700 | 6,223 | None |
| Tuscaloosa, Ala. | 20,659 | 3,511 | Com | 3—3 | 9-16-35—1 | 3,500 | 1,731 | 13,268 | WA |
| Two Rivers, Wis. | 10,083 | 1,100 | Mgr | 9—2 | 4-2-35—5 | 4,621 | 2,848 | 5,869 | EdW |
| Tyler, Tex. | 17,113 | 5,760 | Mgr | 5—2 | 4-2-35—3 | 5,400 | 800 | 10,583 | WA |
| Uniontown, Pa. | 19,544 | 1,356 | MC | 4—4 | 11-12-35—2 | .... | .... | 11,818 | None |
| University City, Mo. | 25,809 | 3,744 | MC | 6—2 | 4-2-35—3 | 11,000 | 7,100 | 17,414 | None |
| Urbana, Ill. | 13,060 | 1,400 | MC | 14—2 | 4-2-35—14 | .... | .... | 8,663 | None |
| Valdosta, Ga. | 13,482 | 3,200 | MC | 6—2 | 3- -36—6 | 1,200 | 900 | 7,960 | W |
| Vallejo, Calif. | 14,476 | 2,852 | Com | 3—4 | 4-2-35—2 | 8,859 | 4,552 | 10,233 | W |
| Valley Stream, N. Y. | 11,790 | 2,326 | MC | 5—2 | 3-19-35—3 | 5,431 | 2,717 | 7,671 | None |
| Vancouver, Wash. | 15,766 | 4,249 | MC | 7—6* | 12- -36—4 | 7,332 | 5,955 | 10,224 | None |
| Vandergrift, Pa. | 11,479 | 450 | MC | 18—4 | 11-5-35—10 | 5,000 | 2,900 | 6,300 | None |
| Ventura, Calif. | 11,603 | 2,451 | Mgr | 7—4* | 4-9-35—3 | 6,233 | 2,123 | 7,706 | W |
| Vicksburg, Miss. | 22,943 | 4,460 | MC | 3—4 | 8- -36—3 | 3,500 | 3,000 | 15,115 | WA |
| Vincennes, Ind. | 17,564 | 1,940 | MC | 7—4 | 11- -38—7 | 10,000 | 9,000 | 10,854 | .... |
| Virginia, Minn. | 11,963 | 5,682 | MC | 9—4 | 1-24-36—3 | 6,500 | 5,600 | 6,939 | EWGMA |
| Wakefield, Mass. | 16,318 | 4,672 | TM | 5—1 | 3-4-35—5 | 7,697 | 4,730 | 9,995 | EGW |
| Walla Walla, Wash. | 15,976 | 2,617 | Com | 3—3 | 12-2-35—3 | 7,000 | 5,807 | 10,863 | WA |
| Wallingford, Conn. | 11,170 | 2,620 | TM | 7—4 | 11- -35—4 | 5,800 | 4,700 | 6,778 | EWA |
| Warren, Pa. | 14,863 | 1,611 | MC | 18—4 | 11- -35—9 | 8,860 | 3,397 | 9,619 | None |
| Warwick, R. I. | 23,196 | 22,525 | MC | 9—2 | 11- -36—9 | 13,229 | 11,000 | 14,429 | W |
| Washington, Pa. | 24,545 | 2,210 | MC | 5—4 | 11-5-35—5 | .... | .... | 14,867 | .... |
| Watertown, S. D. | 10,214 | 4,790 | MC | 10—2 | 4-16-35—5 | .... | 4,077 | 6,196 | EWA |
| Watertown, Wis. | 10,613 | 5,536 | MC | 14—2 | 4-2-35—7 | 5,500 | 4,636 | 7,091 | W |
| Waterville, Me. | 15,454 | 7,680 | MC | 16—1 | 3-4-35—16 | 7,600 | 5,832 | 9,153 | None |
| Watervliet, N. Y. | 16,083 | 824 | Mgr | 3—4 | 11- -35—2 | 7,525 | 6,900 | 10,324 | W |
| Waukesha, Wis. | 17,176 | 2,667 | MC | 12—2 | 4-2-35—6 | 7,500 | 5,291 | 10,716 | W |
| Wausau, Wis. | 23,758 | 4,668 | MC | 18—2 | 4-7-36—18 | 12,000 | 9,400 | 14,650 | W |
| Wauwatosa, Wis. | 21,194 | 2,717 | MC | 10—2 | 4-2-35—5 | 12,110 | 8,160 | 13,714 | W |
| Waycross, Ga. | 15,510 | 5,460 | Mgr | 5—4 | 11- -35—5 | 2,911 | 1,549 | 8,691 | W |
| Waynesboro, Pa. | 10,167 | 1,646 | Mgr | 6—4 | 11-5-35—3 | 5,871 | 2,491 | 6,407 | WM |
| Webster, Mass. | 12,992 | 8,000 | TM | 3—1 | 3-25-35—3 | 5,803 | 4,949 | 7,479 | W |
| Webster Groves, Mo. | 16,487 | 2,560 | Com | 3—2 | 4-2-35—3 | 8,300 | 3,861 | 10,433 | W |
| Wellesley, Mass. | 11,439 | 6,400 | TM | 3—3 | 3-4-35—1 | .... | .... | 7,671 | .... |
| Wenatchee, Wash. | 11,627 | 1,025 | Com | 3—3 | 12- -37—3 | 5,600 | 4,000 | 7,582 | WA |
| Westbrook, Me. | 10,807 | 11,127 | MC | 13—1 | 12- -35—13 | 6,200 | 3,426 | 6,522 | None |
| West Chester, Pa. | 12,325 | 1,100 | MC | 7—4 | 11- -35—3 | .... | .... | 8,286 | W |
| Westerly, R. I. | 10,997 | 19,750 | MC | 7—2 | 11-5-35—7 | .... | .... | 6,547 | W |
| Westfield, Mass. | 19,775 | 30,016 | MC | 11—2 | 12-10-35—11 | 7,722 | 5,753 | 11,546 | EGW |
| Westfield, N. J. | 15,801 | 4,174 | MC | 8—2 | 11-5-35—4 | 6,868 | 5,600 | 10,256 | None |
| West Frankfort, Ill. | 14,683 | 2,640 | Com | 5—4 | 4-16-35—5 | 5,000 | 4,700 | 8,032 | None |
| West Hartford, Conn. | 24,941 | 13,712 | MC | 15—2 | 4-2-35—15 | 13,399 | 8,569 | 16,291 | None |
| West Haven, Conn. | 25,808 | 7,204 | TM | 3—2 | 10-7-35—3 | 11,000 | 9,000 | 16,074 | None |
| West Orange, N. J. | 24,327 | 8,020 | Com | 5—4 | 5-15-38—5 | 12,000 | 9,000 | 15,366 | None |
| W. Palm Beach, Fla. | 26,610 | 9,000 | Mgr | 5—2 | 4-2-35—2 | 5,070 | 782 | 17,775 | M |

Table III.—Governmental Data for the Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Population 1930 | Land Area in Acres | Form of Government | City Council | | Number Registered Voters | Number Voted Last Council Election | Population over 21 in 1930 | Utilities Owned and Operated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Number of Councilmen and Term of Years | Next Election and Number to be Elected | | | | |
| ***10,000 to 30,000—continued*** | | | | | | | | | |
| W. Springfield, Mass. | 16,684 | 10,752 | TM | 3—3 | 2-18-35—1 | 7,300 | 5,000 | 10,146 | W |
| West Warwick, R. I. | 17,696 | 4,480 | MC | 5—2 | 11-6-36—5 | 7,546 | 6,656 | 9,874 | None |
| Wewoka, Okla. | 10,401 | 600 | Com | 3—3 | 4-2-35—1 | .... | .... | 6,209 | WA |
| Weymouth, Mass. | 20,882 | 10,688 | TM | 3—3 | 3- -35—1 | 10,800 | .... | 13,079 | W |
| Whiting, Ind. | 10,880 | 1,100 | MC | 7—4 | 11- -38—7 | 4,816 | 3,300 | 6,096 | W |
| Whittier, Calif. | 14,822 | 2,360 | MC | 5—4 | 4- -36—3 | 9,000 | 4,504 | 10,197 | W |
| Wilkinsburg, Pa. | 29,639 | 1,294 | MC | 9—4 | 9- -35—4 | .... | .... | 20,286 | .... |
| Willimantic, Conn. | 12,102 | 2,870 | MC | 7—2 | 12-2-35—7 | 6,150 | 4,114 | 7,412 | W |
| Wilmette, Ill. | 15,233 | 3,625 | Mgr | 6—2 | 4-16-35—6 | .... | 2,633 | 9,746 | W |
| Wilson, N. C. | 12,613 | 2,500 | Mgr | 5—2 | 4-2-35—5 | 2,350 | 1,521 | 7,238 | EGW |
| Winchester, Mass. | 12,719 | 3,776 | TM | 5—1 | 3-4-35—5 | 6,859 | 3,163 | 8,092 | W |
| Winchester, Va. | 10,855 | 2,560 | Mgr | 13—4 | 4- -36—7 | 1,600 | 416 | 6,804 | W |
| Winnetka, Ill. | 12,166 | 2,330 | Mgr | 7—2 | 4-2-35—4 | 6,120 | 1,518 | 7,802 | EW |
| Winona, Minn. | 20,850 | 5,262 | MC | 9—4 | 4-1-35—5 | 10,171 | 9,060 | 13,529 | W |
| Winthrop, Mass. | 16,852 | 1,024 | TM | .... | .... | 8,581 | 7,262 | 11,311 | W |
| Woburn, Mass. | 19,434 | 8,256 | MC | 15—2 | 11- -35—15 | .... | .... | 11,543 | W |
| Wooster, Ohio | 10,742 | 2,234 | MC | 8—2 | 11-5-35—8 | .... | 5,000 | 7,146 | W |
| Wyandotte, Mich. | 28,368 | 3,520 | MC | 6—2 | 4-1-35—3 | 10,850 | 7,416 | 15,554 | EW |
| Xenia, Ohio | 10,507 | 2,295 | Mgr | 5—4 | 11-5-35—2 | 5,750 | 2,951 | 6,783 | W |
| Yakima, Wash. | 22,101 | 2,515 | Com | 3—3 | 12- -37—3 | 9,280 | 6,260 | 14,268 | W |
| Ypsilanti, Mich. | 10,143 | 2,001 | MC | 10—2 | 4-1-35—5 | 5,400 | 2,498 | 6,770 | GW |

## NOTES ON DIRECTORY OF CITIES OVER 10,000

Albert Lea, Minnesota: Six councilmen serve four-year terms; the mayor two years.

Alexandria, Virginia: Councilmen at large serve three years; ward councilmen serve two years.

Arkansas City, Kansas: Commissioners serve two and four-year terms.

Atchison, Kansas: Councilman receiving highest votes serves four years, other two serve two years.

Benton Harbor, Michigan: Four wards elect one commissioner each year; two of the four "at large" commissioners are elected each year for two-year terms. The mayor serves two years.

Buffalo, New York: The two-year terms of the nine district councilmen overlap, but the four-year terms of the councilmen-at-large do not overlap.

Chicopee, Massachusetts: The aldermen from wards serve one year and their terms do not overlap; those elected at large serve two years and terms overlap.

Concord, New Hampshire: Three members of board of public works are elected for six-year term.

El Dorado, Kansas: Member receiving highest vote serves for four years, other two years.

Elmira, New York: Two councilmen serve for two years and two for four years.

Holyoke, Massachusetts: A bicameral council of seven ward aldermen with one-year terms, and fourteen councilmen with two-year terms overlapping.

Lawrence, Kansas: Adopted mayor-council form of government in 1934 which goes into effect April 1, 1935.

Longview, Washington: Terms are for two years and four years.

Miami, Florida: Two commissioners serve four years, and one serves for two years.

Middlesborough, Kentucky: Two serve two years, one four years.

Nashua, New Hampshire: The ward aldermen serve for two years, the aldermen-at-large for four years.

Newport, Kentucky: The mayor serves four years.

Newton, Kansas: Candidate receiving highest vote serves four years; second highest, two years.

Newton, Massachusetts: A bicameral council of seven aldermen elected by wards for one year, and fourteen aldermen elected at large for two-year terms.

New York City: The legislative body consists of a board of aldermen of 65 and a board of estimate and apportionment of eight members.

Portland, Maine: One councilman is elected each year. Each year, one councilman is selected chairman at no increase in salary. There is no mayor.

Richmond, Virginia: The twenty common councilmen serve two years and the six aldermen serve four years.

Salina, Kansas: Two are elected for four years, and three for two years.

Schenectady, New York: Adopted council-manager plan in 1934 which goes into effect January 1, 1936.

Toledo, Ohio: Adopted manager plan which goes into effect January 1, 1936.

Vancouver, Washington: Six are elected for four years, and one is elected at large for two-year term.

Ventura, California: Three are elected for two years and four for four years.

Washington, D.C.: The governing board of the District is composed of three members, two of whom are appointed by the President with confirmation by the Senate, and one army engineer detailed for four years.

# State Leagues of Municipalities

By C. C. Ludwig

*Staff Member, International City Managers' Association*

MUNICIPAL leagues in the various states are co-operative organizations of cities for mutual betterment and advancement. Cities in their corporate capacity constitute the league members, and dues, usually graded according to population, are paid out of the municipal treasuries. The organization of municipal leagues began in the last decade of the nineteenth century; by the year 1900 there were leagues in the states of California, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. Between the beginning of the century and the World War period new organizations were started in Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, Oklahoma, Utah, Texas, and Virginia. After the war the growth of leagues continued until today there are twenty-five leagues of municipalities with full-time staffs and approximately a dozen more that are served by part-time secretaries and consequently are more or less inactive, including two or three that are just being reorganized. During the last two years the growth of leagues has been greatly stimulated by the depression. The financial stringency in which all cities found themselves and the difficulty of their emergency problems have compelled them to get together in a united front to work out their salvation on a co-operative basis.

The functions and activities of a league of municipalities are many and varied. Each league, no matter how inactive, at least provides for annual meetings at which city representatives get together for two or three days for a discussion of their common problems. Practically every league has a legislative program through which it expresses its opposition to legislation inimical to cities, and its support of legislation favorable to cities. Sometimes the legislative program does not consist definitely of lobbying for an avowed municipal program but consists rather of a legislative bulletin service which informs cities of the day-to-day developments of both friendly and unfriendly bills in the legislature. In addition to the annual meetings and the legislative program, the active leagues provide a variety of day-to-day services such as answering inquiries, making studies of municipal problems, loaning library material, and disseminating news pertaining to municipal developments. This service not only provides answers to specific inquiries sent in by individual cities, but also includes fundamental researches and the preparation of model ordinances and manuals of procedure. To perform this kind of service it is necessary for the leagues to have reference libraries, a full-time staff of specialists in municipal government, facilities for getting out frequent bulletins and letters, and in many cases there is provision also for a monthly magazine. Another of the activities engaged in by some of the stronger leagues is that of conducting training courses for municipal officials of various classes such as police, firemen, and water works superintendents. Some of the leagues engage in consulting service in matters of accounting, engineering, planning, and so forth. A few of the leagues conduct a purchasing information service; two are now experimenting with co-operative and central purchasing whereby a few items are purchased on a large scale on standard specification by the league as agent for several of the cities. Along the line of this type of central co-operative service there has been in recent years considerable discussion not only of co-operative purchasing, but of co-operative insurance as well.

In 1925 the leagues organized a national clearing house known as the American Municipal Association which in 1932 established a full-time secretariat in Chicago. Its function is to supplement the work of the leagues in research and the dissemination of municipal information on a nation-wide basis. It conducts an annual meeting at which city and state experiences are exchanged and national policies for legislative and administrative improvement are formulated. Another activity of the central organization is assistance in the development of existing leagues and the organization of new ones. In the last two years the national organization has assisted the various member leagues through a field service the aim of which is primarily to assist the leagues and cities in making the best possible use of the federal emergency programs—PWA, CWA, relief, etc., and secondarily to assist them with respect to any other problems of pressing importance. The Association through this field service in 1934 provided approximately thirty full-time field agents to help the cities of the United States. A program for similar assistance, but on a somewhat smaller scale in 1935 is now under way. One of the indirect results of this field service has been the strengthening of the membership and services of the state units.

As already stated the leagues are composed of corporate members and dues are paid by the cities. These dues, along with receipts from magazine advertising and other miscellaneous revenues, furnish the financing for the leagues' services. In some cases when the leagues are engaged in sound research activities conducted by trained personnel, grants are secured from foundations interested in improving administration. In several cases the leagues are affiliated or are co-operating quite closely with the state university, an arrangement which makes it possible for them to draw on the

## TABLE IV

## STATE MUNICIPAL LEAGUES

Services and activities during 1934 are discussed in the accompanying article. Official journals of the leagues are listed on page 390. An asterisk (*) indicates nominal or part-time league.

| State | Name of League | Headquarters Address | Secretary | Year First Organized | Number of Member Cities (Over 1,000 Population) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | *Alabama League of Municipalities | Cullman | M. L. Robertson | 1926 | 50 |
| Arkansas | Arkansas Municipal League | Fayetteville | Kenneth O. Warner | 1934 | 13 |
| Arizona | *Arizona Municipal League | Phoenix | Joseph C. Furst | 1925 | ... |
| California | League of California Municipalities | 223 City Hall<br>San Francisco | Richard Graves | 1898 | 186 |
| Colorado | Colorado Municipal League | University of Colorado, Boulder | Don C. Sowers | 1923 | 40 |
| Idaho | *Idaho Municipal Officers' Association | Emmett | George C. Huebener | | ... |
| Florida | Florida League of Municipalities | Barnett Bank Bldg., Jacksonville | E. P. Owen | 1922 | 63 |
| Georgia | *Georgia Municipal League | City Hall<br>Atlanta | Zach Arnold | 1935 | ... |
| Illinois | Illinois Municipal League | 500 E. Capitol Ave., Springfield | A. D. McLarty | 1914 | 290 |
| Indiana | Municipal League of Indiana | Kokomo | Silk Spurgeon | 1899 | 125 |
| Iowa | League of Iowa Municipalities | Marshalltown | Frank G. Pierce | 1898 | 187 |
| Kansas | League of Kansas Municipalities | Fraser Hall<br>Lawrence | John G. Stutz | 1910 | 139 |
| Kentucky | Kentucky Municipal League | City Hall<br>Lexington | Carl B. Wachs | 1929 | 108 |
| Massachusetts | *League of Massachusetts Municipalities | 11 Beacon St.<br>Boston | C. A. Bingham<br>(Acting Sec'y.) | | ... |
| Michigan | Michigan Municipal League | University of Mich.<br>Ann Arbor | Harold D. Smith | 1899 | 122 |
| Minnesota | League of Minnesota Municipalities | University of Minn.<br>Minneapolis | Ambrose Fuller<br>(Acting Director) | 1913 | 143 |
| Mississippi | *Mississippi Municipal Officers' Assn. | Lampton Annex<br>Jackson | C. D. Ross<br>(State Manager) | | 76 |
| Missouri | Missouri Association of Mayors and Other Officials | University of Mo.<br>Columbia | William L. Bradshaw | 1914 | 11 |
| Nebraska | League of Nebraska Municipalities | University of Nebr.<br>Lincoln | C. E. Beals | 1910 | 167 |
| New Jersey | New Jersey State League of Municipalities | Trenton Trust Bldg.,<br>Trenton | S. S. Kenworthy | 1915 | 315 |
| New Mexico | *New Mexico Municipal League | City Hall<br>Albuquerque | Charles E. Wells | | 17 |
| New York | N. Y. State Conference of Mayors and Other Officials | City Hall<br>Albany | William P. Capes | 1910 | 156 |
| North Carolina | North Carolina League of Municipalities | Capital Club Bldg., Raleigh | Patrick Healy, Jr. | 1922 | 80 |
| North Dakota | League of North Dakota Municipalities | City Hall<br>Bismarck | M. H. Atkinson | 1927 | 39 |
| Ohio | *Ohio Municipal League | City Hall<br>Columbus | S. J. Barrick | 1911 | ... |

TABLE IV.—STATE MUNICIPAL LEAGUES—Continued

| State | Name of League | Headquarters Address | Secretary | Year First Organized | Number of Member Cities (Over 1,000 Population) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| klahoma ........ | Oklahoma Municipal League | University of Okla.<br>Norman | F. C. Higginbotham | 1913 | 80 |
| regon ........... | League of Oregon Cities | University of Oregon<br>Eugene | Herman Kehrli | 1913 | 49 |
| ennsylvania ...... | *Pa. League of Third-Class Cities | Coatesville | Walter E. Greenwood (President) | 1900 | 44 |
| ennsylvania ...... | *Pa. State Association of Boroughs | Hanover | T. F. Chrostwaite (President) | 1900 | ... |
| outh Dakota ..... | League of South Dakota Municipalities | University of S. D.<br>Vermillion | G. R. Breckenridge | 1925 | 29 |
| ennessee ........ | *Tennessee Municipal League | Tullahoma | John W. Harton (President) | 1913 | ... |
| exas ............ | League of Texas Municipalities | 2220 Guadalupe<br>Austin | E. E. McAdams | 1913 | 102 |
| tah ............. | *State Municipal League of Utah | Provo | Terry J. Oldroyd | 1907 | ... |
| irginia .......... | League of Virginia Municipalities | Travelers Bldg.<br>Richmond | Morton L. Wallerstein | 1905 | 71 |
| ashington ....... | Assoc. of Washington Cities | University of Wash.<br>Seattle | Russell W. Barthell | 1932 | 41 |
| est Virginia ..... | League of West Virginia Municipalities | Box 427<br>Charleston | Hume K. Nowlan | 1924 | ... |
| isconsin ........ | League of Wisconsin Municipalities | 114 N. Carroll<br>Madison | Frederick N. MacMillin | 1898 | 164 |

part-time service of the political science faculty as well as to use the university library and other facilities. Often free space is provided in university buildings; occasionally the league headquarters are in the state capitol or in some city hall. The municipal leagues of the country, the names of their present secretaries, headquarters address, number of member cities, and dates of organization are given in Table IV.

About a dozen of the leagues (those indicated by an asterisk (*) in Table IV) are relatively inactive and do not attempt to perform the full range of standard league functions because they receive only nominal or part-time service from their secretaries. Most of them, however, hold an annual convention and undertake a more or less aggressive legislative program. In Ohio, Massachusetts, and possibly Idaho, state law does not permit cities to pay dues to league organizations; in the first two states campaigns are under way to secure this authority for cities.

A brief summary of the organization, recent activities, and current legislative program of the twenty-five more active leagues as given below indicates the great value and importance of their work in improving the administration of local government in the United States.

## ARKANSAS MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

The Arkansas Municipal League, organized in 1934, performs in a small way practically all of the usual functions of a standard league except training schools and consulting service. It publishes *Arkansas Municipalities*. The league co-operates closely with, and uses the services and facilities of the University of Arkansas. Its current legislative program includes: (1) requiring the personal property taxes on automobiles to be paid before licenses may be issued; (2) 50 per cent sharing in the road tax; (3) exemption of cities from the state gasoline tax; (4) annual financial reporting to the state.

## LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA MUNICIPALITIES

The California league performs all of the usual services of an active league except training schools for officials. It has organized special sections for mayors and councilmen, managers, attorneys, clerks, auditors, assessors, treasurers, engineers, street superintendents, planning officials, and health officials. The league also includes thirteen regional divisions. The special developments of the California league in 1934 were the reorganization and the tying in of the former loose and independent regional leagues into an integral part of the state organization; the rapid growth of the league's legislative influence; and the arrangement whereby *Western City*, the California league's magazine, also became the official journal of the Oregon and Washington leagues. The major items of the current legislative program include: (1) an increased share in the gasoline tax; (2) a limitation on municipal liability; and (3) greater local authority for regulation and for a share in the revenue from liquor licenses and taxes.

## COLORADO MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

The Colorado league carries on the standard activities including training schools for police, fire, water works superintendents, and engineers. Its official journal is *Colorado Municipalities*. The league co-operates closely with the Rocky Mountain Section of the American Water Works Association, with the State Firemen's Association, and is in process of organizing a section for attorneys. The special developments in 1934 were the use of regional meetings, a concerted attack on the sewage disposal problem of the state, and the completion of the third five-year survey of civic conditions, which includes a detailed analysis and appraisal of municipal services and costs in the cities of the state. The current legislative program includes: (1) local sharing in state taxes; (2) long-range public works planning; (3) local liquor control; (4) encouraging the construction of sewage disposal plants throughout the state; and (5) opposition to tax limitations.

## FLORIDA LEAGUE OF MUNICIPALITIES

The Florida league conducts all of the activities of a standard league except training schools for officials. Its official journal is *Florida Municipal Record*. The league has a separate section for attorneys and participates in a co-operative arrangement with the Florida Institute of Accountants. It employs a special consultant on rate and traffic problems. The league in 1934 acted as co-operative legal counsel for the cities of the state in a bond case which resulted in a ruling that utility earnings of cities may not be tied up through mandamus action by general city bondholders unless such earnings have been pledged by revenue bonds. The current legislative program includes: (1) deferring action until the next session of the legislature on the uniform municipal government amendment; (2) a commission for studying the replacement of revenues lost because of the homestead exemption amendment; (3) any new revenues provided should be used first to replace local tax losses; (4) exemption from state taxes on city purchases or property; (5) maintenance by the state of state highways within city limits; (6) strengthening of the laws on liquor control; (7) a state debt adjustment act; and (8) permitting separate budgets for debt service and for general operation in cities.

## Illinois Municipal League

The Illinois Municipal League conducts the standard league activities except training schools for officials. Its magazine is the *Illinois Municipal Review*. It has a consulting service on ordinance revision and on accounting installations. It has special divisions for clerks and finance officers, attorneys, utility officials, public works and engineering officials, and city planning and zoning officials. In 1934 the league moved from Urbana to Springfield. Its current legislative program includes: (1) municipal home rule, including the requirement for a referendum vote on all local questions; (2) exemption from state taxes; (3) four-year terms for mayors and councilmen; (4) a state constitutional convention; (5) reimbursement for cost of constructing state highways within cities; (6) revision of special assessment procedure; and (7) retention of the city's share of gasoline tax without reduction for other purposes, and the privilege of using the city's share for any local highway purpose.

## Municipal League of Indiana

The Municipal League of Indiana is on a part-time basis and carries on the activities of an annual convention, including regional meetings during the year, and a legislative program. Its official journal is the *Municipal League Review*. It has a section for utility operators. Its current legislative program includes: (1) exemption from the state gross income and property taxes; and (2) the construction and maintenance by the state of the state highways within city limits.

## League of Iowa Municipalities

The Iowa league conducts an annual convention and regional meetings, has a legislative program, and conducts an inquiry service, including a special consulting service on ordinance revision. Its official journal is *American Municipalities*. Its current legislative program includes: (1) home rule for cities and opposition to central control over local officials; (2) exemption from state sales and gasoline taxes; (3) city sharing in proceeds of the gasoline tax; (4) local regulation and sharing in liquor licenses and taxes; (5) city sharing in automobile registration taxes; (6) authority to bid in on tax sales without cash payments; and (7) allowance of damages to cities when cities are the winners in litigation brought by the private utility companies against the cities' utility competition.

## League of Kansas Municipalities

The Kansas league conducts all of the standard activities including training schools for policemen, clerks, and finance officers, and a consulting service covering ordinance codification, engineering problems, auditing, and city planning. The league's magazine is *Kansas Municipalities*. A purchasing information service is conducted. The league also functions as the secretariat for the Kansas Police Association and the Kansas

Water and Sewage Works Association. The league's current legislative program includes: (1) more equitable sharing in the state gasoline and registration taxes; (2) tightening of tax collection procedure; and (3) extension of the work relief program by the state.

## KENTUCKY MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

The Kentucky league carries on the usual activities including training schools for clerks, fire chiefs, and police chiefs. *Kentucky City* is its official organ. The special developments in 1934 were the enlargement of the league activities, large increase in the number of members, and the raising of dues. Many regional meetings were also held for the first time. The legislative program includes: (1) exemption from the gasoline tax and a share in the proceeds of the same; (2) authorization for revenue utility bonds; (3) requirement of notice in case of damage claims; (4) tightening of bank taxation; (5) exemption of the cities from the regulation of public service commission; and (6) exemption from the state sales tax.

## MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

The Michigan league conducts the entire range of league services, including training schools for firemen, and consulting services covering charter revision, utility studies, and debt adjustment or refunding studies. It publishes the *Michigan Municipal Review*. The league engages in co-operative purchasing for the cities of the state, emphasizing at the present time mainly fire hose and a few other items. Special sections have been organized for city managers, engineers and public works officials, and attorneys. A plan is under way to set up similar sections for finance officers, assessors, and clerks. Special developments in 1934 include charter revision service in ten cities and the beginning of the consulting service for cities on debt problems. Of interest also is the attempt to demonstrate the workability of certain administrative techniques. For this purpose the League effected a co-operative arrangement with the small community of Saline, whereby a charter was written, installation of a practical accounting system made, and various other modern municipal practices introduced. This interesting experiment, conducted in the municipal laboratory of this little city, is attracting considerable attention throughout the state and the results obtained will aid in improving and refining the various administrative practices and will undoubtedly point the way for their adoption by other governmental subdivisions. The Michigan Municipal League does not emphasize legislative program, but during the past year went on record as opposing the proposed reduction of the gasoline and automobile registration taxes, and as favoring a state tax for relief purposes.

## LEAGUE OF MINNESOTA MUNICIPALITIES

The Minnesota league carries on the entire range of league activities including training schools for firemen and police and a consulting service for ordinance codification, charter revision, and city planning studies. Its magazine is *Minnesota Municipalities*. The league has a special section for attorneys and has co-operative arrangements with the Municipal Utilities Association, the State Sanitary Conference, the Tax Conference, and the Conference for Dairy Inspectors. By way of publications, the league's major contribution is the *Minnesota Year Book* which is a comprehensive volume of statistical information on municipal and state affairs. The league's current legislative program includes in the field of federal relationships the request for more public works money, arrangements for the completion of CWA airports, federal money at cost, and a relief program announced sufficiently in advance so that adequate planning may be done. In the state field the current legislative program includes: (1) a study of the tax system; (2) authority for cities to engage in the gas utility business; and (3) transfer of the financial burden of the old age pension system from local to state government.

## MISSOURI ASSOCIATION OF MAYORS AND OTHER OFFICIALS

The Missouri league, reorganized in 1934, is indirectly affiliated with the University of Missouri. It holds an annual convention and regional meetings, prepares a legislative program, and conducts an inquiry service. Friendly relations are maintained with separate organizations of utility operators, city attorneys, policemen, and firemen, and also with the St. Louis County League of Municipalities. The Association's current legislative program includes: (1) centralization of administration including the appointment rather than the election of city marshals; (2) providing for more competition in the bidding for city bank deposits; (3) more equitable allocation of utility assessed valuations; (4) broadening the licensing powers of third and fourth class cities; (5) tightening the delinquent tax collection procedure; and (6) increasing regulatory power and revenue-sharing in liquor control and taxation.

## LEAGUE OF NEBRASKA MUNICIPALITIES

The activities of the Nebraska league include an annual convention, regional meetings, a legislative program, publication of the *Nebraska Municipal Review,* an inquiry service, training schools for police, and a consulting service for auditing. It is now in process of transferring headquarters to Lincoln, the state capital, where use will be made of the University facilities for inquiry and research service. Special sections have been organized for attorneys, utility operators, city clerks, and police. The league's current legislative program includes: (1) authorizing electric plant revenue bonds; (2) extending to first-class cities the right to make delinquent water bills property liens; (3) the appointment instead of election of water commissioners; (4) 10 per cent share in the county motor vehicle tax fund; (5) compensating police magistrates in second-class cities on a salary instead of fee basis; (6) optional authority to create utility districts; and (7) opposition to a minimum wage law for public works employees, to an indeterminate permit law for utilities, and to tax limitations.

## NEW JERSEY STATE LEAGUE OF MUNICIPALITIES

The New Jersey league carries on the usual activities except training schools and consulting service. *New Jersey Municipalities* is its official journal. The league has special sections for assessors, attorneys, building inspectors, clerks, engineers, tax collectors, overseers of the poor, shade tree commissioners, and recreation officials, and is affiliated with the New Jersey branch of the American Water Works Association and the Association of Municipal Officials of South Jersey. The current legislative program includes: (1) requirement that all governmental units shall share in tax delinquencies, not cities alone as at present; (2) recommendation of a state sales tax for three years and a permanent state income tax, as replacement taxes; (3) shifting to state support of the functions of the county court, prosecutors, the old-age pension and other county welfare costs; (4) sharing in the gasoline tax; and (5) opposition to tax limitations.

## NEW YORK STATE CONFERENCE OF MAYORS AND OTHER OFFICIALS

The New York league carries on a complete range of activities including a great deal of research and preparation of model ordinances. The training schools for municipal officials cover firemen, policemen, fiscal officers, assessors, purchasing agents, personnel officers, and clerks. The league conducts a purchasing information service, as well as an equipment exchange service. It publishes no magazine but relies on bulletins and many special publications to disseminate its news, answers to inquiries, research studies, model ordinances, etc. The league is organized in sections for fire chiefs, engineers, attorneys, clerks, signal officials, sanitary officials, election officials, purchasing agents, building inspectors, sewage works officials, sealers of weights and measures, police chiefs, plumbing inspectors, and electric utility operators. The current legislative program includes: (1) requiring security by public depositories; (2) requiring competitive bidding for the construction and maintenance contracts let by privately owned utility companies as in the case of publicly owned utilities; (3) a 50 per cent share in the gasoline tax; and (4) a more equitable distribution of other state taxes which are shared with the city. On federal matters the league opposes the inclusion of cities in any code and suggests a relief wage differential so as to encourage relief employees to get into private employment.

## NORTH CAROLINA LEAGUE OF MUNICIPALITIES

The North Carolina league in 1934 was reorganized on a full-time basis and moved its headquarters to Raleigh. It conducts a full range of league activities with the exception of training schools for officials. A consulting service for utilities is being organized. Outside of reorganization and growth in members, the outstanding accomplishment in 1934 consisted of the league's intervention in a city telephone rate case with the result that a 12 per cent reduction was secured in telephone rates in fifty-eight exchanges in the state. The major items of the current legislative program are: (1) sharing in the gasoline tax; and (2) the development of municipal home rule, preferably through constitutional amendment.

## LEAGUE OF NORTH DAKOTA MUNICIPALITIES

The activities of the North Dakota league include an annual convention and regional meetings, a legislative program, and an inquiry service. The current legislative program includes: (1) recommendations for a relief program partaking of the nature of CWA with liberal provisions for materials and equipment expense; (2) a share in the gasoline tax; (3) a share in the liquor revenues; (4) a clarification of the liquor law; and (5) greater leeway for refunding bonds.

## OKLAHOMA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

The Oklahoma league conducts most of the usual activities including training schools for firemen and police. It publishes the *Oklahoma Municipal Review*. It has sections organized for managers, finance officers, attorneys, engineers, utility operators, policemen, and firemen. The current legislative program includes: (1) sharing in liquor licenses; (2) receiving six mills of the fifteen-mill property taxes; (3) exemption from state taxes; (4) notices in case of damage claims; (5) authority for appointment instead of election of administrative officials; (6) one-eighth sharing in the gasoline tax; (7) authority to issue revenue bonds; and (8) in cases involving city liability, changing the legal status of park activities from "proprietary" to "governmental."

## League of Oregon Cities

The Oregon league was reorganized late in 1933, placed on a full-time basis, and moved to Eugene where it is affiliated with, and uses the facilities of the University of Oregon. Its activities and number of members have been greatly expanded. It conducts all of the regular league activities except training schools for public officials. The consulting service includes debt surveys, general reorganization surveys, ordinance and charter revision, and city planning studies. The league's participation in the Portland pension study and the Portland police reorganization study, as well as its Enterprise debt study, Huntington charter revision, and the Oregon City and Medford administrative survey were the outstanding jobs done in 1934. The Oregon league joins the California and Washington leagues in supporting *Western City* as the official journal. The current legislative program includes: (1) sharing of liquor revenues; (2) a commission to study municipal legislation; (3) exemption from the gasoline tax; (4) nonpartisan municipal elections; (5) prohibition of payment of petition circulators in the initiative, referendum, and recall laws; (6) removal of various limitations preventing cities from participating in the federal public works program; and (7) a state debt adjustment commission.

## League of South Dakota Municipalities

The South Dakota league was reorganized in 1934 and headquarters established at Vermillion where it is affiliated with the University of South Dakota. The activities include the annual convention and regional meetings, a legislative program, and an inquiry and bulletin service. A training school is conducted for water works plant operators. The current legislative program includes: (1) state co-ordination of law enforcement officials; (2) real estate assessments biennially instead of annually; (3) authorization for special municipal collectors for delinquent personal taxes; (4) a quarter share in the money and credits tax, a quarter share in the gross income tax, a quarter share in the automobile registration tax, and a half share in the liquor license revenue; (5) authorizing revenue bonds or conditional sales contracts for financing extensions of existing municipal utilities; (6) authorization of baby bonds; (7) state appropriations for conducting a state fire school; and (8) a state survey of underground water supply and continuation of the services of the state sanitary engineer.

## League of Texas Municipalities

The Texas league was reorganized on a full-time basis in 1934 and moved to Austin where it is affiliated with the University of Texas. Its activities include the full range of league activities including training schools for police and water works officials. *Texas Municipalities* is its journal. It has special sections for city managers, finance officers, attorneys, firemen and fire marshals, and has a co-operative relationship with the Texas Public Health Association. The current legislative program includes: (1) exemption from the gasoline tax; (2) financing by the state of state highways within city limits; (3) a drivers' license law; and (4) a state bureau of identification and a state system of police intercommunication.

## League of Virginia Municipalities

The Virginia league is one of the older leagues of the country and performs the entire range of league services including training schools for police, firemen, and water works officials, and consulting services on ordinance codification, administrative surveys, utility studies, engineering studies, audits, and accounting installations. *The Virginia Municipal Review* is the journal of the league. It conducts a purchasing information service; has special sections for police executives, fire chiefs, and building officials; and is affiliated with the Police Instructors' Institute. While the Virginia league does not emphasize a legislative program, it has taken a position in favor of the state sales tax and in favor of long-time planning by the state and cities. It conducts a legislative information service.

## Association of Washington Cities

The Association was reorganized in 1934 and placed on a full-time basis with headquarters in Seattle where it is affiliated with the University of Washington. It conducts the full range of league activities although it has not yet developed training schools for officials or a consulting service. It uses *Western City* as its official journal jointly with California and Oregon. There are as yet no functional sections. Its current legislative program is concentrated on the effort to secure for cities a quarter share of the automobile registration tax. It conducts a legislative information service.

## League of West Virginia Municipalities

The West Virginia league has just been reorganized on a full-time basis with headquarters at Charleston. Its range of activities includes an annual convention, regional meetings, a legislative program, and an inquiry service. Its major activity in 1934 was a struggle for the financial survival of the cities in the face of the drastic property tax limitations put into effect. The main objectives in the legislative program cover: (1) a fair share for cities of the limited property taxes; (2) exemption from the gasoline tax; (3) protection for city bank deposits; and (4) repeal of the pay cut statute.

## League of Wisconsin Municipalities

The Wisconsin league, one of the oldest leagues, conducts all of the standard league services including training schools for finance officers, assessors, sewage plant operators, water works superintendents, and electric utility operators. It conducts a consulting service for ordinance revision and for planning and zoning studies. It conducts a purchasing information service and buys fire hose for some of its cities on a cooperative plan. *The Municipality* is its monthly magazine. It has special sections for attorneys, clerks and finance officers, engineers and public works officials, building inspectors, plumbing inspectors, park and recreation officials, and assessors. The league's legislative program includes two main planks: (1) greater city sharing in state-collected taxes; and (2) the expansion of municipal home rule.

# PART THREE

# MUNICIPAL PERSONNEL

Municipal Personnel Data
Retirement Systems
Professional Organizations of Municipal Officials
City Manager Profession and Directory
Directories of City Officials

# Municipal Personnel Data

THIS article summarizes the information in Table V which enumerates for each of 257 cities of over 30,000 population the number of full-time and part-time employees, amount spent for salaries and wages in 1934, and certain data relating to pay cuts and restorations since 1930.

*Number of Employees.* The data summarized in Table 1 represents the first known attempt to make a direct enumeration of the number of employees in American cities. Municipal officials were asked to report on two groups of employees: (1) the total number of full-time regular officials and employees (except schools) on December 31, 1934, whose salaries were appropriated by the city council; and (2) the approximate number of part-time and seasonal employees reduced to a yearly basis. The part-time employees in most cases and the full-time employees in a few instances were only reasonable approximations, but it is believed that the data which resulted are more reliable than any of the estimates which have been made regarding the extent of municipal employment.[1] In 1934 there were 399,703 employees (yearly basis) in 257 cities of over 30,000 population (Table 1). Presumably this figure excludes educational employees and employees working on municipal projects financed by the state and federal governments. Some difficulty was experienced in securing accurate reports on the number of part-time and seasonal employees but in every instance an attempt was made to clear up all returns which were inconsistent or inaccurate on their face. Some cities failed to report part-time employees, but

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES (EXCEPT SCHOOLS) IN 257 CITIES IN 1934

| Population Group | No. Cities Reporting | 1930 Population of Cities Reporting | Full-Time Employees (Except Schools) | Part-Time Employees (Yearly Basis) | Total No. Employees (Yearly Basis) | Total No. Employees per 1,000 Pop. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Over 500,000 | 13 | 20,828,542 | 214,418 | 4,993 | 219,411 | 10.5 |
| 200,000 to 500,000 | 25 | 7,985,454 | 60,403 | 6,777 | 67,180 | 8.4+ |
| 100,000 to 200,000 | 42 | 5,437,586 | 41,038 | 4,393 | 45,431 | 8.4— |
| 30,000 to 100,000 | 177 | 8,996,654 | 59,387 | 8,294 | 67,681 | 7.5 |
| All Cities Over 30,000 | 257 | 43,248,236 | 375,246 | 24,457 | 399,703 | 9.2 |

---

[1] The most recent estimate is reported in *National Income, 1928-32* (U. S. Department of Commerce), Sen. Doc. No. 124, 73d Cong., 2d Session, pp. 129-131, in which it is stated that there were approximately 591,505 employees in all cities in 1932. This estimate, however, cannot be compared with the figure reported in this article because it applies to a different group of cities and was obtained by a different method.

these cities have been included on the assumption that some cities failed to report them entirely making their returns somewhat low, that other cities included part-time employees in the full-time figure without reducing them to a yearly basis making their returns somewhat high, and that these two factors would tend to balance each other. In any event, the total for these cities must be taken as a reasonable approximation secured on the largest number of cities that have ever been contacted directly for this purpose.

Inter-city comparisons of the number of employees should not be undertaken because of the obvious variety in the number and type of services performed by individual cities. However, it is entirely possible to compare cities by population groups with respect to the number of employees in proportion to the total population of the cities reporting. This comparison verifies the well-known assumption that as cities increase in size they undertake varied and complex functions to a greater degree than the increase in population would indicate. This assumption has always been considered to mean that municipal expenditures tend to increase faster than the increase in population and that municipal government is an "industry" of increasing costs. This is now borne out with respect to municipal personnel, expenditures for which constitute the major part of the operating budget. The number of employees per thousand population in cities in the smallest population group is 7.5 which rises steadily to 10.5 in cities over 500,000 and amounts to 9.2 for all of the 257 cities over 30,000 (Table 1).

TABLE 2

AVERAGE SALARIES IN 206 CITIES IN 1934

| Population Group | No. Cities Included | Total Employees (Yearly Basis) | Total Salaries & Wages in 1934 | Average Salary |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cities Over 500,000 | 10 | 179,789 | $350,496,401 | $1,949 |
| 200,000 to 500,000 | 20 | 50,963 | 75,899,319 | 1,489 |
| 100,000 to 200,000 | 32 | 30,362 | 43,547,903 | 1,434 |
| 30,000 to 100,000 | 144 | 54,678 | 69,853,824 | 1,278 |
| All Cities Over 30,000 | 206 | 315,792 | $539,797,447 | $1,709 |

*Salary and Wage Expenditures.* Municipal officials were asked to report total expenditures for salaries and wages in 1934 for all full- and part-time employees (except schools) whose pay is appropriated by the city council. In computing average salaries for the various population groups, care was taken to include only those cities which reported both the number of full-time employees and the number of part-time employees on a yearly basis. Applying this criterion, the results for 206 cities are indicated in Table 2.

The average salary for municipal employees bears a direct relation to the size of the city, and the average for cities over 500,000 far exceeds that for the smaller cities. Explanation for the higher average in the larger cities may be found in any one or more of a number of causes. For example, the higher cost of living in large cities may require these cities to pay higher salaries in order to secure personnel of equal competence with that secured in smaller cities at a lower salary; or the larger cities may require higher competence in certain positions and therefore be forced to pay higher salaries to secure it; or the proportion of supervisory to routine positions may be greater in the larger cities than in the smaller cities. In any event there is a striking variation in average salaries between population groups.

The $1,709 average salary figure for all cities over 30,000 may be compared with the per capita income of $1,514 for all municipal employees in 1932 reported by the United States Department of Commerce.[2] The difference is undoubtedly due to the fact that all cities over 2,500 were included in the latter estimate, and the larger proportion of small cities tended to bring the average down. The $1,709 average also may be compared with the average of $1,827 reported for federal employees in the executive departments in 1933, the average of $1,830 for federal postal employees in 1933, the $1,417 average for public school teachers in 1932, $1,620 for state employees of New Jersey in 1932-33, and $1,299 for state employees of North Carolina in 1932-33.[3] The average salaries for employees of municipal fire departments have been reported from another source as $2,324 in 1932, and for employees of municipal police departments as $2,299 in 1932,[4] which indicates that these two groups are paid a much higher wage than municipal employees as a whole.

*Salary Cuts.* Of 252 cities reporting only 14 or 5.6 per cent have not cut salaries at all during the five year period since 1930. Of the 238 cities which have reduced expenditures for wages, 19 cities or 8 per cent have made full restoration, 91 or 38.2 per cent have made partial restoration, and 128 or 53.8 per cent have made no restoration at all. The size of the cuts ranged from 3 per cent for certain employees in San Francisco, California, and Tucson, Arizona, to 50 per cent for a group of employees in Macon, Georgia.

TABLE 3

SALARY CUTS SINCE 1930 IN 252 CITIES

| Population Group | No. Cities Reporting | No. Reporting No Salary Cut | Number Cities Reporting Cut | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Total | Full Restoration | Part Restoration | No Restoration |
| Over 500,000 | 13 | 1 | 12 | 3 | 6 | 3 |
| 200,000 to 500,000 | 24 | 0 | 24 | 2 | 10 | 12 |
| 100,000 to 200,000 | 42 | 4 | 38 | 3 | 11 | 24 |
| 30,000 to 100,000 | 173 | 9 | 164 | 11 | 64 | 89 |
| All Cities over 30,000 | 252 | 14 | 238 | 19 | 91 | 128 |

---

[2] *Ibid,* pp. 129 and 131.

[3] *Cf.* Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel, *Better Government Personnel* (McGraw-Hill, 1935) pp. 160, 162.

[4] *Ibid,* p. 166.

## TABLE V

## PERSONNEL DATA FOR 257 CITIES OVER 30,000

This table shows number of employees in 1934, salary and wage expenditures in 1934, and data relative to salary reductions according to information reported by municipal officials in February, 1935. An asterisk (*) refers to notes at the end of this table. Under "Employee Groups Excluded from Total," "L" stands for Libraries, "U" for Utilities, "P" for Parks, and "DL" for Day Laborers. Under "Amount Cut Restored, Date, and Employees Affected," "F" stands for firemen, "P" for policemen, "DL" for day laborers. A summary of this table is contained in the pages immediately preceding.

| City | Population 1930 (000 omitted) | Total Number Employees (Except Schools) | No. Full-Time Employees (Except Schools) | No. Part-Time Employees, yearly basis (Except Schools) | Employee Groups Excluded from Total | Total 1934 Salary and Wage Expenditure | Per cent Salaries and Wages Reduced Since 1930 | Amount Cut Restored, Date, and Employees Affected |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***Over 500,000*** | | | | | | | | |
| Baltimore, Md. | 805 | 4,289 | 4,189 | 100 | None | $ 7,076,897 | None | |
| Boston, Mass. | 781 | 14,292 | 14,292 | ... | None | 19,124,106 | 5-15 | Full, '35, All |
| Buffalo, N. Y. | 573 | 5,033 | 4,833 | 200 | L | 13,076,942 | 7½-30 | None |
| Chicago, Ill. | 3,376 | 24,590 | 24,590 | None | * | 48,000,000 | 21 | Part, '34, F,Po |
| Cleveland, Ohio | 900 | 10,000 | 8,000 | 2,000 | L | 12,633,299 | 25 | None |
| Detroit, Mich. | 1,569 | 20,917 | 20,439 | 478 | None | 36,035,980 | 19* | * |
| Los Angeles, Calif. | 1,238 | 7,964 | 7,814 | 150 | U,L,P* | 15,757,158 | 10 | None |
| Milwaukee, Wis. | 578 | 5,600 | 5,000 | 600 | * | 10,474,771 | 10 | Part, '35, All |
| New York, N. Y. | 6,930 | 87,064 | 86,364 | 700 | * | 181,430,033 | 6-30 | Part, '34, All |
| Philadelphia, Pa. | 1,951 | 18,000 | 18,000 | ... | .... | 31,000,000 | 15 | Full, '34, All |
| Pittsburgh, Pa. | 670 | 5,110 | 4,940 | 170 | None | 8,699,000 | 16⅔ | Part, '34* |
| St. Louis, Mo. | 822 | 7,330 | 7,330 | ... | L | 14,629,816 | 10 | Full, '34, All |
| San Francisco, Calif. | 634 | 9,222 | 8,627 | 595 | None | 17,312,321 | 3-20 | Part, '34, All |
| ***200,000 to 500,000*** | | | | | | | | |
| Akron, Ohio | 255 | 1,217 | 1,177 | 40 | L | 1,488,767 | 25 | Part, '34, F,Po |
| Atlanta, Ga. | 270 | 2,613 | 2,613 | ... | None | 3,406,907 | 17-20 | None |
| Birmingham, Ala. | 260 | 842 | 842 | None | DL | 875,000 | 4-10 | Part, '34, All |
| Cincinnati, Ohio | 451 | 4,299 | 4,299 | ... | L | 5,941,429 | 5-20 | Part, '35, All |
| Columbus, Ohio | 291 | 2,200 | 2,000 | 200 | None | 3,000,000 | 20 | None |
| Dallas, Tex. | 260 | 2,168 | 1,985 | 183 | L | 2,388,583 | 5-20 | * |
| Dayton, Ohio | 201 | 1,505 | 1,193 | 312 | L | 1,750,678 | 14½ | None |
| Denver, Colo. | 288 | 900 | 800 | 100 | U | 4,975,434 | 10 | Full, '34, All |
| Houston, Tex. | 292 | 1,892 | 1,892 | None | L* | 2,164,105 | 20 | None |
| Jersey City, N. J. | 317 | 3,694 | 3,594 | 100 | L | 6,639,428 | 23-32 | None |
| Kansas City, Mo. | 400 | 4,426 | 4,326 | 100 | L | 4,632,594 | 20 | None |
| Louisville, Ky. | 308 | 2,109 | 1,509 | 600 | U,L | 2,629,834 | 8 | Part, '35, All |
| Minneapolis, Minn. | 464 | 2,129 | 1,529 | 600 | L,P* | 3,200,000 | 5-20 | None |
| Newark, N. J. | 442 | 5,605 | 5,605 | ... | None | 10,184,113 | 15 | None |
| New Orleans, La. | 459 | 5,396 | 5,396 | ... | None | 4,500,000 | 30 | None |
| Oakland, Calif. | 284 | 2,142 | 1,872 | 270 | None | 3,412,439 | 15 | Part, '34, F, Po |
| Omaha, Neb. | 214 | 1,008 | 768 | 240 | U | 1,155,000 | 20 | None |
| Portland, Ore. | 302 | 1,933 | 1,883 | 50 | L | 3,191,682 | 18 | Part, '34* |
| Providence, R. I. | 253 | 3,700 | 3,700 | ... | L | 4,391,500 | 10 | None |
| Rochester, N. Y. | 328 | 3,700 | 3,372 | 328 | None | 5,649,726 | 10 | Part, '35, All |
| St. Paul, Minn. | 272 | 2,244 | 1,694 | 550 | DL | 1,951,724 | 10-15 | None |
| San Antonio, Texas | 232 | 1,470 | 1,470 | None | U,L | 1,091,293 | 10-40 | Part, '34, All |
| Seattle, Wash. | 366 | 5,449 | 5,120 | 329 | None | 8,568,032 | 30 | Full, '34, F, Po* |
| Toledo, Ohio | 291 | 1,985 | 1,910 | 75 | L | 3,000,000 | 20 | None |
| Washington, D. C. | 487 | 7,950 | 5,250 | 2,700 | None | 14,135,000 | 15 | Part, '34, All |
| ***100,000 to 200,000*** | | | | | | | | |
| Albany, N. Y. | 127 | 909 | 877 | 32 | U,L,P* | .... | None | |
| Bridgeport, Conn. | 147 | 1,324 | 1,231 | 93 | None | 1,611,688 | 20 | None |

TABLE V.—PERSONNEL DATA FOR CITIES OVER 30,000—Continued

| City | Population 1930 (000 omitted) | Total Number Employees (Except Schools) | No. Full-Time Employees (Except Schools) | No. Part-Time Employees, yearly basis (Except Schools) | Employee Groups Excluded from Total | Total 1934 Salary and Wage Expenditure | Per cent Salaries and Wages Reduced Since 1930 | Amount Cut Restored, Date, and Employees Affected |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *100,000 to 200,000—continued* | | | | | | | | |
| Camden, N. J. | 119 | 1,000 | 700 | 300 | L | $1,000,000 | 30 | Part, '34, All |
| Canton, Ohio | 105 | 800 | 288 | 512 | U,P | 809,970 | 10 | None |
| Des Moines, Iowa | 143 | 788 | 788 | * | U,L | 1,344,000 | 8⅓-18 | None |
| Duluth, Minn. | 101 | 720 | 570 | 150 | L,P | 1,089,662 | 16⅔ | Part, '35, All |
| Elizabeth, N. J. | 115 | 750 | 700 | 50 | None | 1,305,000 | 10 | None |
| El Paso, Tex. | 102 | 389 | 321 | 68 | L | 656,095 | 19 | Part, '34, All |
| Erie, Pa. | 116 | 560 | 408 | 152 | U,L | 852,911 | 10 | Full, '35, All |
| Evansville, Ind. | 102 | 700 | 600 | 100 | L | 920,339 | 10 | None |
| Flint, Mich. | 156 | 615 | 615 | None | L,P* | 960,500 | 23 | None |
| Fort Wayne, Ind. | 115 | 550 | 400 | 150 | U,L | 800,000 | 15 | None |
| Fort Worth, Tex. | 163 | 1,103 | 1,103 | None | L | 1,453,977 | 15-22 | None |
| Gary, Ind. | 100 | 550 | 500 | 50 | None | 700,000 | 20 | None |
| Grand Rapids, Mich. | 169 | 1,325 | 1,275 | 50 | None | 1,627,497 | 30 | None |
| Hartford, Conn. | 164 | 2,362 | 2,112 | 250 | U,L | .... | 10 | None |
| Jacksonville, Fla. | 130 | 1,943 | 1,943 | ... | None | 2,577,161 | 10 | Part, '35, All |
| Knoxville, Tenn. | 106 | 800 | 600 | 200 | None | 1,800,000 | 25 | None |
| Long Beach, Calif. | 142 | 1,689 | 1,639 | 50 | None | 2,919,591 | 30 | None |
| Lynn, Mass. | 102 | 965 | 965 | ... | None | 1,346,390 | 10 | Full, '34, All |
| Miami, Fla. | 111 | 1,129 | 1,104 | 25 | L | 1,448,911 | None | |
| New Haven, Conn. | 163 | 1,466 | 1,266 | 200 | None | 2,473,885 | 20 | Part, '34, All |
| Norfolk, Va. | 130 | 1,192 | 976 | 216 | None | 1,594,841 | 22½ | None |
| Oklahoma City, Okla. | 185 | 1,004 | 954 | 50 | None | 1,301,172 | 10-20 | None |
| Peoria, Ill. | 105 | 500 | 300 | 200 | L,P* | 560,234 | 10 | None |
| Reading, Pa. | 111 | 790 | 440 | 350 | None | 1,050,000 | None | |
| Richmond, Va. | 183 | 1,950 | 1,950 | ... | None | 2,802,908 | 10 | None |
| Salt Lake City, Utah | 140 | 1,093 | 1,083 | 10 | L | 1,390,324 | 10 | Part, '35, All |
| San Diego, Calif. | 148 | 1,290 | 1,200 | 90 | None | 1,903,977 | 25 | Part, '35, All |
| Scranton, Pa. | 143 | 925 | 525 | 400 | L | .... | 10 | None |
| Somerville, Mass. | 104 | 1,050 | 1,050 | None | None | 1,700,000 | 15 | Part, '35, All |
| South Bend, Ind. | 104 | 407 | 357 | 50 | U,L,P | 567,375 | 25 | Part, '35, All |
| Spokane, Wash. | 116 | 790 | 490 | 300 | None | 1,052,299 | 19 | Part, '35, All |
| Springfield, Mass. | 150 | 2,444 | 2,224 | 220 | L | 4,075,862 | 15 | Part, '34, All |
| Tacoma, Wash. | 107 | 1,098 | 1,098 | ... | None | 835,126 | 22 | None |
| Tampa, Fla. | 101 | 800 | 800 | ... | None | 968,431 | 25 | None |
| Trenton, N. J. | 123 | 1,112 | 1,087 | 25 | L | 1,596,000 | 20 | None |
| Tulsa, Okla. | 141 | 750 | 750 | None | None | 1,050,000 | 15 | None |
| Wichita, Kans. | 111 | 432 | 382 | 50 | U,L,P | 631,793 | 15-33½ | None |
| Wilmington, Del. | 107 | 1,250 | 1,250 | None | None | 1,300,000 | None | |
| Worcester, Mass. | 195 | 2,017 | 2,017 | ... | None | 4,762,379 | 21½ | Full, '35, All |
| Yonkers, N. Y. | 135 | 2,100 | 2,100 | ... | None | 4,250,000 | 15 | None |
| *30,000 to 100,000* | | | | | | | | |
| Alameda, Calif. | 35 | 260 | 260 | None | None | 350,000 | 10 | Part, '34, All |
| Allentown, Pa. | 93 | 510 | 450 | 60 | L | 500,000 | 10 | Full, '35, All |
| Alton, Ill. | 30 | 110 | 95 | 15 | U,L,P | 113,705 | 10 | None |
| Altoona, Pa. | 82 | 378 | 343 | 35 | P | 432,675 | 10 | None |
| Amarillo, Tex. | 43 | 259 | 209 | 50 | L | 262,140 | 45 | Part, All |
| Anderson, Indiana | 40 | 580 | 300 | 280 | L | 500,000 | 7 | None |
| Asheville, N. C. | 50 | 435 | 360 | 75 | None | 464,000 | 10 | None |
| Auburn, N. Y. | 37 | 305 | 225 | 80 | U,L | 332,444 | 10 | Part, '34, All |
| Aurora, Ill. | 47 | 235 | 235 | ... | None | 159,188 | 33⅓ | Part, '34, All |
| Austin, Tex. | 53 | 753 | 679 | 74 | None | 815,000 | 15 | Part, All |
| Baton Rouge, La. | 31 | 212 | 212 | None | U,L | 222,100 | 10 | None |
| Bay City, Mich. | 47 | 475 | 450 | 25 | L | 285,000 | 26 | Part, '34, F, Po |
| Beaumont, Tex. | 58 | 367 | 367 | None | None | 436,817 | 33⅓ | Part, '34, All |
| Bellingham, Wash. | 31 | 200 | 160 | 40 | None | 244,770 | 25 | None |

## TABLE V.—PERSONNEL DATA FOR CITIES OVER 30,000—Continued

| City | Population 1930 (000 omitted) | Total Number Employees (Except Schools) | No. Full-Time Employees (Except Schools) | No. Part-Time Employees, yearly basis (Except Schools) | Total Employee Groups Excluded from Total | Total 1934 Salary and Wage Expenditure | Per cent Salaries and Wages Reduced Since 1930 | Amount Cut Restored, Date, and Employees Affected |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***30,000 to 100,000—continued*** | | | | | | | | |
| Berkeley, Calif. ...... | 82 | 459 | 445 | 14 | U,L | $727,480 | 5 | Part, '34, All |
| Berwyn, Ill. .......... | 47 | 270 | 170 | 100 | U,L,P | 224,000 | 10 | None |
| Bethlehem, Pa. ....... | 58 | 350 | 250 | 100 | L | 338,664 | 10 | None |
| Binghamton, N. Y. .... | 77 | 1,091 | 1,060 | 31 | None | 1,276,305 | 10 | Part, '35, All |
| Bloomfield, N. J. ...... | 38 | 161 | 157 | 4 | L | 293,918 | 5-25 | None |
| Brookline, Mass. ...... | 47 | 835 | 821 | 14 | None | 2,100,069 | 10 | Full, '34, All |
| Butte, Montana ....... | 40 | 92 | 92 | ... | U,L | 147,911 | 20 | Part, '34, F, Po |
| Cedar Rapids, Iowa .... | 56 | 188 | 164 | 24 | None | .... | 10 | None |
| Charleston, S. C. ...... | 62 | 470 | 470 | None | .... | 600,000 | 15 | None |
| Charleston, W. Va. .... | 60 | 240 | 240 | ... | .... | 315,776 | 10-20 | None |
| Charlotte, N. C. ...... | 83 | 584 | 542 | 42 | L,P | 672,550 | 7 | Part, '34* |
| Chelsea, Mass. ........ | 46 | 400 | 370 | 30 | None | 555,169 | 20 | Part, '34, All |
| Chester, Pa. .......... | 59 | 133 | 130 | 3 | U,L | .... | 15 | Part, '35* |
| Chicopee, Mass. ....... | 44 | 650 | 600 | 50 | None | 1,000,000 | 15 | None |
| Cleveland Hgts., Ohio . | 51 | 312 | 226 | 86 | L | 426,859 | 20 | None |
| Clifton, N. J. ........ | 47 | 174 | 158 | 16 | None | 382,916 | 15 | None |
| Colorado Springs, Colo. | 33 | 465 | 365 | 100 | None | 486,179 | 7½-15 | None |
| Columbus, Ga. ....... | 43 | 400 | 400 | ... | U,L | 312,500 | 12½ | Part, '34, All |
| Council Bluffs, Iowa .. | 42 | 180 | 166 | 14 | U,L,P | 234,475 | None | |
| Covington, Ky. ....... | 65 | 550 | 450 | 100 | L,P | .... | 17 | None |
| Cranston, R. I. ........ | 43 | 160 | 160 | ... | L,P* | 269,342 | 10 | None |
| Cumberland, Md. ..... | 38 | 147 | 97 | 50 | L | 204,033 | 4 | None |
| Danville, Ill. ......... | 37 | 102 | 102 | None | U,L,DL | 158,510 | 25 | None |
| Dearborn, Mich. ...... | 50 | 502 | 372 | 130 | None | 868,216 | 15 | Part, '34, All |
| Decatur, Ill. .......... | 58 | 240 | 240 | ... | L | 283,198 | 25 | Part, '34 All |
| Dubuque, Iowa ....... | 42 | 247 | 242 | 5 | None | 280,200 | 19 | None |
| Durham, N. C. ...... | 52 | 207 | 207 | None | L | 315,289 | 15 | None |
| East Chicago, Ind. .... | 55 | 263 | 202 | 61 | U,L | 419,611 | 15-20 | Part, '35, F, Po |
| East Cleveland, Ohio .. | 40 | 192 | 138 | 54 | U,L | 277,626 | 15 | None |
| Easton, Pa. .......... | 34 | 271 | 226 | 45 | L | 296,735 | 6 | None |
| East Orange, N. J. .... | 68 | 502 | 502 | ... | None | 958,898 | 5-20 | None |
| Elgin, Ill. ........... | 36 | 183 | 163 | 20 | L | 191,500 | 25 | None |
| Elkhart, Ind. ......... | 33 | 137 | 107 | 30 | L | 180,322 | 10 | None |
| Elmira, N. Y. ........ | 47 | 405 | 365 | 40 | U,L | 542,525 | 10 | Part, '34, DL |
| Evanston, Ill. ........ | 63 | 476 | 460 | 16 | None | 719,760 | 22 | None |
| Everett, Wash. ........ | 31 | 216 | 160 | 56 | None | 271,074 | 20 | None |
| Fitchburg, Mass. ...... | 41 | 530 | 500 | 30 | None | 673,931 | 15 | Part, '34, All |
| Fort Smith, Ark. ...... | 31 | 184 | 154 | 30 | L | 180,000 | 14½ | None |
| Fresno, Calif. ........ | 53 | 481 | 481 | None | L | 824,057 | 10 | Full, '34, All |
| Galveston, Texas ...... | 53 | 500 | 450 | 50 | L* | 551,515 | 5 | Part, '34, All |
| Glendale, Calif. ...... | 63 | 501 | 487 | 14 | None | 809,121 | 8 | None |
| Green Bay, Wis. ...... | 37 | 282 | 282 | None | None | 343,624 | 15 | None |
| Greensboro, N. C. .... | 54 | 325 | 315 | 10 | * | 408,700 | 17 | Part, '34, All |
| Hagerstown, Md. ...... | 31 | 176 | 175 | 1 | L | 242,309 | 10 | Part, '34,* |
| Hamilton, Ohio ...... | 52 | 250 | 237 | 13 | L | 485,644 | 20 | Part, '34, All |
| Hammond, Ind. ...... | 65 | 338 | 338 | None | U,L | 550,419 | 15 | Part, '35, F, Po |
| Hamtramck, Mich. .... | 56 | 453 | 235 | 218 | None | 672,000 | 15 | Part, '34, All |
| Harrisburg, Pa. ...... | 80 | 652 | 564 | 88 | L | 710,401 | 10 | Part, '35, All |
| Highland Park, Mich. .. | 53 | 680 | 680 | None | None | 679,484 | 40 | Part, '34, All |
| High Point, N. C. .... | 37 | 239 | 233 | 6 | None | 286,446 | 10 | Full, '34, All |
| Hoboken, N. J. ...... | 59 | 611 | 551 | 60 | None | 1,217,000 | 10 | None |
| Holyoke, Mass. ....... | 57 | 944 | 584 | 360 | U,L | 900,461 | 15 | Part, '34, All |
| Huntington, W. Va. .... | 76 | 230 | 220 | 10 | L,P | 316,654 | 10 | Part, '34, F, Po* |
| Irvington, N. J. ...... | 57 | 210 | 210 | None | U | 528,000 | 16 | None |
| Jackson, Mich. ........ | 55 | 465 | 465 | None | P | 409,808 | 30 | Part, '34, F, Po* |
| Jackson, Miss. ........ | 48 | 295 | 295 | None | None | 253,776 | 25 | Part, '34, All |
| Joplin, Mo. .......... | 33 | 166 | 141 | 25 | * | 206,516 | 10 | None |

TABLE V.—PERSONNEL DATA FOR CITIES OVER 30,000—Continued

| City | Population 1930 (000 omitted) | Total Number Employees (Except Schools) | No. Full-Time Employees (Except Schools) | No. Part-Time Employees, yearly basis (Except Schools) | Employee Groups Excluded from Total | Total 1934 Salary and Wage Expenditure | Per cent Salaries and Wages Reduced Since 1930 | Amount Cut Restored, Date, and Employees Affected |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***30,000 to 100,000—continued*** | | | | | | | | |
| Kalamazoo, Mich. | 55 | 450 | 275 | 175 | L | $600,000 | 16 | Part, '35, All |
| Kearny, N. J. | 41 | 307 | 298 | 9 | U | 618,758 | 10 | None |
| Kenosha, Wis. | 50 | 319 | 319 | ... | U,L | 562,370 | 23½ | Part, '35, All |
| Kokomo, Ind. | 33 | 130 | 130 | ... | L | 157,341 | 40 | Part, '34, F, Po |
| La Crosse, Wis. | 40 | 282 | 275 | 7 | L | 363,300 | 10 | Part, '35, F, Po |
| Lakewood, Ohio | 71 | 554 | 379 | 175 | L | 534,020 | 10-31 | None |
| Lancaster, Pa. | 60 | 386 | 307 | 79 | None | 378,024 | 10 | Part, '35, All |
| Lansing, Mich. | 78 | 550 | 325 | 225 | U,L | 750,000 | 19 | Part, '34,* |
| Lawrence, Mass. | 85 | 1,100 | 800 | 300 | None | 1,375,000 | 15 | Part, '35, All |
| Lewiston, Me. | 35 | 200 | 150 | 50 | None | 260,000 | 10 | Part, '34, F, Po |
| Lexington, Ky. | 46 | 410 | 390 | 20 | U,L | 470,975 | 10 | Part, '35, All |
| Lima, Ohio | 42 | 240 | 190 | 50 | L | 262,894 | 7½ | None |
| Lincoln, Nebr. | 76 | 590 | 515 | 75 | L | 725,980 | 5-20 | None |
| Little Rock, Ark. | 82 | 300 | 300 | ... | None | 339,445 | 20 | Part, '34, All |
| Lorain, Ohio | 45 | 215 | 165 | 50 | L | 383,311 | 10 | None |
| Lynchburg, Va. | 41 | 430 | 400 | 30 | L | 426,611 | 15-20 | None |
| McKeesport, Pa. | 55 | 350 | 300 | 50 | U,L | 411,626 | 25 | Part, '34, All |
| Macon, Ga. | 54 | 295 | 295 | None | U | 93,140 | 10-50 | Part, '35, All* |
| Madison, Wis. | 58 | 620 | 570 | 50 | None | 698,390 | 15-30 | None |
| Malden, Mass. | 58 | 720 | 645 | 75 | None | 735,075 | 10 | None |
| Manchester, N. H. | 77 | 800 | 600 | 200 | None | 1,134,300 | 10 | Full, '34, All |
| Mansfield, Ohio | 34 | 165 | 150 | 15 | L | 254,576 | 10 | None |
| Marion, Ohio | 31 | 193 | 153 | 40 | L | 190,000 | 20 | Full, '35, All |
| Moline, Ill. | 32 | 150 | 150 | None | L* | 187,649 | 10 | Part, '34, All |
| Montgomery, Ala. | 66 | 650 | 650 | ... | L | .... | 15 | None |
| Mt. Vernon, N. Y. | 61 | 348 | 348 | ... | U,L | 872,000 | 20 | Part, '35, All |
| Muncie, Ind. | 47 | 300 | 200 | 100 | None | .... | 25 | Part, '35, F, Po |
| Muskegon, Mich. | 41 | 353 | 253 | 100 | L | 225,000 | 25-30 | None |
| Muskogee, Okla. | 32 | 250 | 200 | 50 | None | 180,000 | 25 | None |
| Nashua, N. H. | 31 | 27 | 27 | ... | None | 39,740 | 10 | None |
| Newark, Ohio | 31 | 213 | 199 | 14 | L | 282,820 | None | .... |
| New Brunswick, N. J. | 35 | 340 | 300 | 40 | None | 400,000 | 15 | None |
| New Castle, Pa. | 49 | 200 | 200 | None | L | 265,235 | 10 | None |
| Newport News, Va. | 34 | 240 | 225 | 15 | U | 291,744 | 10 | None |
| New Rochelle, N. Y. | 54 | 558 | 520 | 38 | None | .... | 17 | Part, '35, All |
| Niagara Falls, N. Y. | 75 | 571 | 371 | 200 | L,DL | 1,000,000 | 10 | None |
| Norwalk, Conn. | 36 | 240 | 200 | 40 | U,L | 280,992 | 22 | None |
| Norwood, Ohio | 33 | 140 | 90 | 50 | L,P | .... | .... | .... |
| Oak Park, Ill. | 64 | 311 | 307 | 4 | L | 550,606 | None | .... |
| Ogden, Utah | 40 | 176 | 146 | 30 | L | 263,507 | 10 | None |
| Orange, N. J. | 35 | 188 | 188 | None | L,P | .... | 10 | None |
| Oshkosh, Wis. | 40 | 620 | 420 | 200 | None | 381,819 | 15 | Part, '35, F, Po |
| Paducah, Ky. | 34 | 173 | 168 | 5 | U,L,P | 174,621 | 20 | None |
| Pasadena, Calif. | 76 | 1,315 | 1,118 | 197 | None | 2,019,321 | 19 | Part, '34, All |
| Passaic, N. J. | 63 | 420 | 420 | None | L | 716,298 | 19 | None |
| Pensacola, Fla. | 32 | 215 | 215 | ... | L | 360,000 | 10 | Full, '34, All |
| Perth Amboy, N. J. | 44 | 312 | 312 | ... | .... | 443,847 | 20 | None |
| Phoenix, Ariz. | 48 | 525 | 525 | ... | None | 723,393 | 12½ | Part* |
| Pittsfield, Mass. | 50 | 329 | 307 | 22 | U,L* | 388,181 | 10 | None |
| Plainfield, N. J. | 34 | 235 | 200 | 35 | L,P | 380,330 | 15-30 | None |
| Pontiac, Mich. | 65 | 420 | 400 | 20 | U | .... | 20 | Part, '34, All |
| Port Arthur, Tex. | 51 | 130 | 130 | None | None | 123,011 | 20 | Part, '34, All |
| Port Huron, Mich. | 31 | 280 | 195 | 85 | U | 236,130 | 30 | None |
| Portland, Me. | 71 | 447 | 447 | ... | U,L | 1,160,001 | 10 | None |
| Portsmouth, Ohio | 43 | 200 | 140 | 60 | None | 290,021 | 10 | None |
| Portsmouth, Va. | 46 | 281 | 281 | None | L | 276,000 | 15 | None |
| Poughkeepsie, N. Y. | 40 | 75 | 75 | None | * | 117,204 | 10 | None |

## TABLE V.—PERSONNEL DATA FOR CITIES OVER 30,000—Continued

***30,000 to 100,000—continued***

| City | Population 1930 (000 omitted) | Total Number Employees (Except Schools) | No. Full-Time Employees (Except Schools) | No. Part-Time Employees, yearly basis (Except Schools) | Employee Groups Excluded from Total | Total 1934 Salary and Wage Expenditure | Per cent Salaries and Wages Reduced Since 1930 | Amount Cut Restored, Date, and Employees Affected |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pueblo, Colo. | 50 | 228 | 198 | 30 | U,L | $276,000 | 15 | None |
| Quincy, Ill. | 39 | 335 | 260 | 75 | U,L,P | .... | 10-15 | None |
| Quincy, Mass. | 72 | 1,085 | 785 | 300 | None | 1,787,101 | None | .... |
| Racine, Wis. | 68 | 511 | 400 | 111 | None | 511,274 | 20 | Full, '35, All |
| Raleigh, N. C. | 37 | 258 | 252 | 6 | L | 299,712 | 25 | Part, '34, All |
| Revere, Mass. | 36 | 374 | 215 | 159 | None | 314,653 | 20 | None |
| Richmond, Ind. | 32 | 304 | 304 | ... | L | .... | .... | .... |
| Roanoke, Va. | 69 | 526 | 523 | 3 | U | 629,600 | 17½ | None |
| Rockford, Ill. | 86 | 410 | 410 | None | L,P | 481,853 | 25 | None |
| Rome, N. Y. | 32 | 227 | 205 | 22 | L | 327,444 | 10 | Part, '34, All |
| Sacramento, Calif. | 94 | 875 | 825 | 50 | None | 1,425,618 | 6 | Part, '35, DL |
| Saginaw, Mich. | 81 | 562 | 562 | ... | L | 503,052 | 30 | None |
| St. Joseph, Mo. | 81 | 565 | 465 | 100 | U | 586,800 | 10 | Full, '34, All |
| St. Petersburg, Fla. | 40 | 718 | 676 | 42 | None | 685,329 | 15 | None |
| San Bernardino, Calif. | 37 | 155 | 155 | None | U | 217,533 | 18 | None |
| San Jose, Calif. | 58 | 223 | 221 | 2 | U | 458,752 | None | .... |
| Santa Ana, Calif. | 30 | 175 | 160 | 15 | None | 258,595 | 20 | None |
| Santa Barbara, Calif. | 34 | 350 | 350 | None | None | 511,024 | 15 | None |
| Santa Monica, Calif. | 37 | 630 | 565 | 65 | None | .... | None | .... |
| Savannah, Ga. | 85 | 963 | 963 | None | None | 999,095 | 19 | Full, '35, All |
| Sheboygan, Wis. | 39 | 558 | 508 | 50 | U | 461,387 | 15 | None |
| Shreveport, La. | 77 | 560 | 550 | 10 | * | 543,860 | 30 | Part, '33, All |
| Sioux City, Iowa | 79 | 537 | 337 | 200 | None | 777,378 | 10 | None |
| Sioux Falls, S. D. | 33 | 227 | 217 | 10 | None | 361,500 | 12 | None |
| Springfield, Ill. | 72 | 571 | 571 | ... | L,P | 819,141 | 10 | Part, '34, All |
| Springfield, Mo. | 58 | 306 | 206 | 100 | U,L,P | 340,976 | 10 | None |
| Springfield, Ohio | 69 | 444 | 444 | ... | L | 594,947 | None | .... |
| Stamford, Conn. | 46 | 434 | 344 | 90 | .... | 670,000 | 10 | None |
| Steubenville, Ohio | 35 | 235 | 211 | 24 | None | 214,941 | 25 | None |
| Stockton, Calif. | 48 | 377 | 367 | 10 | U | 586,905 | 20 | None |
| Superior, Wis. | 36 | 325 | 239 | 86 | L | 476,849 | 18 | Part, '33, All |
| Topeka, Kans. | 64 | 336 | 316 | 20 | L | 560,580 | 5 | None |
| Troy, N. Y. | 73 | 865 | 700 | 165 | U,L | 1,138,841 | None | .... |
| Tucson, Ariz. | 33 | 252 | 214 | 38 | L | 311,879 | 3-36 | None |
| Union City, N. J. | 59 | 500 | 500 | None | None | 834,526 | 10 | None |
| Waco, Tex. | 53 | 316 | 301 | 15 | U,L,P* | 352,517 | 22 | Part, '34, All |
| Waltham, Mass. | 39 | 491 | 395 | 96 | None | 554,378 | 15 | Part, '33, All |
| Warren, Ohio | 41 | 185 | 135 | 50 | L | 256,735 | 20-30 | Part, '34, All |
| Waterbury, Conn. | 99 | 1,400 | 1,400 | ... | None | 1,591,923 | 20 | Part, '34, All |
| Waterloo, Iowa | 46 | 220 | 189 | 31 | None | 304,621 | 20 | None |
| Watertown, Mass. | 35 | 417 | 342 | 75 | U | 576,673 | .... | .... |
| Watertown, N. Y. | 32 | 292 | 167 | 125 | None | 442,404 | 10 | None |
| Waukegan, Ill. | 33 | 81 | 81 | ... | U,L,P | 200,000 | 10 | None |
| West Allis, Wis. | 35 | 243 | 229 | 14 | None | 335,503 | 10 | Full, '35, F, Po |
| Wheeling, W. Va. | 62 | 375 | 375 | None | L,P | 479,428 | 29½ | None |
| Wichita Falls, Tex. | 44 | 227 | 217 | 10 | None | 198,031 | 25 | Part, '34, DL |
| Williamsport, Pa. | 46 | 178 | 163 | 15 | L | 231,619 | 10 | None |
| Winston-Salem, N. C. | 75 | 502 | 301 | 201 | None | 544,800 | 10-24 | Part, '34, All |
| York, Pa. | 55 | 180 | 150 | 30 | L | 217,000 | None | .... |

## NOTES ON PERSONNEL DATA IN CITIES OVER 30,000

(An asterisk in the table refers to these notes; cities in alphabetical order without regard to population.)

ALBANY, NEW YORK: Employees in the street department are not included.

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS: Number of full-time employees includes the employees of Boston and Suffolk County, both of which are governed by the same legislative body.

CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA: Restoration applied to all employees receiving less than $90 per month.

CHESTER, PENNSYLVANIA: Reports restoration of pay-cuts as applying to "girls" only.

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS: Does not include officials and employees of the Chicago Sanitary District and the Chicago Park District which are separate local governments.

CRANSTON, RHODE ISLAND: Employees of the highway department are not included.

DALLAS, TEXAS: The 5 per cent salary cut was restored to all employees receiving less than $1,200 per year on December 1, 1934. Part restoration of the 12 per cent cut affecting salaries between $1,200 and $2,000 per year was made on January 1, 1935, and no restoration has been made for salaries above $2,000 per year.

DES MOINES, IOWA: The number of part-time employees is included in the 788 full-time employees.

DETROIT, MICHIGAN: Two 10 per cent cuts were made for all employees, and in addition a 50 per cent salary cut for two months during the year. Full restoration was made to members of the police department on June 1, 1934, and a part restoration to all other employees.

FLINT, MICHIGAN: Welfare and hospital employees are not included in the number of full-time officers and employees.

GALVESTON, TEXAS: Employees of city-owned hospital are not included in number of full-time officials and employees.

GREENSBORO, NORTH CAROLINA: Welfare employees not included in total number of officials and employees.

HAGERSTOWN, MARYLAND: Restoration of pay cut applied to general government and public health employees and employees of the municipal light plant.

HOUSTON, TEXAS: Port employees also excluded from total number of officials and employees.

HUNTINGTON, WEST VIRGINIA: Restoration of pay cut applied to some other employees in addition to members of the fire and police departments.

JACKSON, MICHIGAN: Restoration of pay cut applied to some department heads in addition to members of fire and police departments.

JOPLIN, MISSOURI: Employees of the children's home not included in total number of full-time officials and employees.

LANSING, MICHIGAN: Full restoration of the pay cut was made to all hourly employees and to employees receiving $1,000 or less. Approximately 50 per cent of the cut was restored to those receiving more than $1,000.

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA: Employees of the playground and recreation department are also not included in the total number of full-time officials and employees.

MACON, GEORGIA: Full restoration was made to members of the fire and police departments.

MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN: Employees of the metropolitan sewerage commission are not included in the total number of full-time officials and employees.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA: Employees of the civil service commission, the board of estimate and taxation, and of the pension department are not included in the total number of full-time officials and employees.

MOLINE, ILLINOIS: Hospital employees are not included in the total number of full-time officials and employees.

NEW YORK CITY: Subway employees are not included in the total number of full-time officials and employees.

PEORIA, ILLINOIS: Employees of the tuberculosis sanitarium are not included in the total number of full-time officials and employees.

PHOENIX, ARIZONA: The small restoration of pay cut applied to "mostly laborers and clerks."

PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA: Restoration of pay cut applied only to those salaries of $1,500 per year or less.

PITTSFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS: Laborers and employees of the public works department are also not included in the total number of full-time officials and employees.

PORTLAND, OREGON: Restoration of pay cut applied only to clerks.

POUGHKEEPSIE, NEW YORK: Figure for number of employees does not include employees of the board of public welfare, highway, police, and health departments, and the city hospital.

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON: Full restoration of pay cut was also made to the linemen in the light and highway departments in 1935.

SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA: Employees on weekly payrolls in the water, street, and park departments are not included in the total number of full-time officials and employees.

WACO, TEXAS: Employees of the recreation department are also not included in the total number of full-time officials and employees.

WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT: The figure for total expenditures for salaries and wages does not include wages of employees working on the construction of sewers, bridges, and other capital improvements, whose number is included in the total number of full-time regular officials and employees.

# Municipal Retirement Systems

THIS article summarizes the detailed data in Table VI pertaining to the retirement systems in effect in 228 cities of over 30,000 population. Thirty-nine additional cities report they have no retirement system of any type. The term "retirement system" is conceived broadly to include all cities which pursue a more or less definite policy of retiring employees for reasons of old age or disability or which pay benefits in the event of death before retirement. Cities which do not have any regularized system providing for city and/or employee contributions to a specific fund but which nevertheless appropriate money each year for pension purposes are also included in Table VI. A retirement system conceived in this sense is in active operation in at least 228 cities of more than 30,000 population as shown in Table 1. Cities reporting a pension policy but which did not pay out any money for that purpose in 1934 are not included.

Table 1

Cities Reporting Retirement Systems in 1934

| Population Group | Total No. Cities | No. Cities Reporting | Cities Reporting Retirement System |  | Cities Reporting No System |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | Number | Per Cent of those Reporting | Number | Per Cent of those Reporting |
| Over 500,000........ | 13 | 13 | 13 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 200,000 to 500,000... | 28 | 27 | 26 | 96.3 | 1 | 3.7 |
| 100,000 to 200,000... | 52 | 43 | 42 | 97.7 | 1 | 2.3 |
| 30,000 to 100,000.... | 217 | 184 | 147 | 80.0 | 37 | 20.0 |
| All Cities Over 30,000. | 310 | 267 | 228 | 85.4 | 39 | 14.6 |

The fact that retirement systems are in effect in 85.4 per cent of all cities over 30,000 reporting such information should not be interpreted to mean that the same proportion of municipal employees is covered. In a great majority of cities the retirement system applies only to one or both of the fire and police departments which together in most cities constitute less than one-half of all city employees. In only 58 or 25.4 per cent of the 228 cities are all or nearly all employees covered by the retirement system.

There are many variations in retirement systems most of which are not susceptible to tabulation and many of which cannot be secured by the questionnaire method. However, the data reported show that two-thirds of the retirement systems are supported jointly by city and employee contributions while one-fifth are supported entirely by city appropriations (Table 2).

## TABLE 2

### NATURE OF CONTRIBUTIONS FOR RETIREMENT PURPOSES IN 228 CITIES REPORTING A RETIREMENT SYSTEM

| | Cities Reporting Retirement System | | Supported Jointly by City and Employees | | Supported Wholly by City | | Supported Wholly by Employees | | Supported Wholly by State Aid | | Indeterminate as to Contribution | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent |
| Over 500,000 | 13 | 100 | 12 | 92.3 | 1 | 7.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 200,000 to 500,000 | 26 | 100 | 21 | 80.8 | 5 | 19.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 100,000 to 200,000 | 42 | 100 | 32 | 76.2 | 6 | 14.3 | 2 | 4.7 | 1 | 2.4 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 30,000 to 100,000 | 147 | 100 | 83 | 56.5 | 36 | 24.5 | 9 | 6.1 | 3 | 2.0 | 16 | 10.9 |
| All Cities Over 30,000 | 228 | 100 | 148 | 64.9 | 48 | 21.0 | 11 | 4.8 | 4 | 1.8 | 17 | 7.5 |

The nature of the benefits allowed by the retirement system varies from city to city. Almost all systems provide for old age retirement (222 or 97.4 per cent). A large proportion of cities provide benefits in the event of death (188 or 82.5 per cent) or disability (202 or 88.6 per cent) in the line of duty. A smaller percentage of cities allows benefits in the event of ordinary death (120 or 52.6 per cent) or disability (132 or 57.9 per cent) before the retirement age is reached.

The amounts contributed in 1934 by the city and the employees for pension purposes and the benefits paid do not indicate anything as to the soundness or unsoundness of the pension fund. Most pension funds have other sources of revenue such as interest on investments on which information was not requested, and receipts from miscellaneous license fees and taxes which in most instances were not reported. In a few instances retirement systems for firemen are supported partially or wholly by revenues from a state-administered locally-shared tax on fire insurance. Where possible this information has been included in the notes following Table VI. Revenues of this type were received by cities in Arkansas, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, and Wisconsin, and in at least four instances are reported as sufficient to support the retirement system without other contributions from local sources. High Point, North Carolina, secures all revenue for its fire and police retirement system by earmarking for this purpose one dollar of all costs paid in the municipal court.

The actuarial soundness of a retirement system is a fact which cannot be ascertained accurately by questionnaire. However, one question asked was stated as follows: "Is the retirement system based on an actuarial reserve which includes an estimate of demands on the fund and provides for contributions adequate to meet these demands when they arise?" While 219 of the 228 cities with retirement systems answered this question, it is clear that actuarial soundness can be accurately determined only by a thorough actuarial study. It cannot be assumed that such studies have been made in all of the 74 cities answering "yes." The data recorded from the questionnaires, therefore, indicate only the stated opinions of the reporting officers as to whether or not their systems are based on an actuarial reserve. In two-thirds of the cities reporting pension systems the plan is not on an actuarial basis (Table 3).

### TABLE 3

### ACTUARIAL STATUS OF RETIREMENT SYSTEMS IN 219 CITIES

| | Cities Reporting | | Cities Reporting Actuarial Reserve | | Cities Reporting No Actuarial Reserve | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent |
| Over 500,000 ......... | 13 | 100 | 8[1] | 61.5 | 5 | 38.5 |
| 200,000 to 500,000..... | 25 | 100 | 6[2] | 24.0 | 19 | 76.0 |
| 100,000 to 200,000..... | 42 | 100 | 15[3] | 35.7 | 27 | 64.3 |
| 30,000 to 100,000...... | 139 | 100 | 45 | 32.4 | 94 | 67.6 |
| All Cities Over 30,000.. | 219 | 100 | 74 | 33.8 | 145 | 66.2 |

[1] The two largest systems in New York City and the police system in St. Louis are based on an actuarial reserve; other systems in these two cities are not.

[2] The retirement system in Seattle, Washington, is on an actuarial basis for all city employees, except members of the fire and police departments.

[3] The retirement system in Peoria, Illinois, is on an actuarial basis for policemen but not for firemen and in San Diego for all city employees except policemen and firemen.

New York state has established a retirement system on a sound actuarial basis which is administered for cities by the state comptroller. Certain groups of employees in all New York cities of over 30,000, except New York City and Amsterdam, are members of this system. The system provides for contributions both by the city and by the employees. Firemen and policemen in most of these cities are covered not by the state system but by a supplementary system administered by the city. Employees covered by the state system may retire at the age of 60 and must retire at the age of 70. A state system is also in effect in Minnesota in which cities may participate at option. Duluth was the only city reporting whose employees are covered by the state system.

# Table VI

## DATA ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS IN 267 CITIES OVER 30,000

This table shows basic data relating to retirement systems in effect in 228 cities in 1934 according to information reported by municipal officials in February, 1935. The 39 cities which reported having no retirement systems are listed separately at the end of this table; 43 other cities did not report at all. An asterisk refers to notes which also follow the table. The data in this table are summarized in the accompanying article.

| City | Population 1930 | Established by Statute (S), Charter (C), Ordinance (O) | Employees Included |  | Amount Contributed to Fund in 1934 |  | Amount Paid in Benefits in 1934 | Benefits Allowed |  |  |  |  | Minimum Retirement Age or Service in Years (S) | Actuarial Reserve |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | Per Cent of Total | Classes of Employees | By City | By Employees |  | Old Age Retirement | Death |  | Disability |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ordinary | In Line of Duty | Ordinary | In Line of Duty |  |  |
| ***Over 500,000*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baltimore, Md. .... | 804,874 | S-C | 80 | All | $1,420,000 | $ 550,000 | $ 669,000 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Boston, Mass. ...... | 781,188 | S | 75 | All | 1,599,441 | 890,000 | 1,300,000 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Buffalo, N. Y. .... | 573,076 | S | 60* | * | 378,100 | 408,134 | 382,069 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Chicago, Ill. ...... | 3,376,438 | S | 100 | All | 6,800,000 | 1,800,000 | 6,234,000 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 55, 20S | Yes |
| Cleveland, Ohio ... | 900,429 | S-C | 25 | Fire, Police | 601,283 | None | 355,892 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 25S | No |
| Detroit, Mich. ..... | 1,568,662 | C | 18 | * | 896,945 | 110,480 | 1,106,121 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 25S | No |
| Los Angeles, Calif.. | 1,238,048 | O | 25 | Fire, Police | 825,649 | 366,120 | 983,871 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 25S | Yes |
| Milwaukee, Wis. .. | 578,249 | S | 33 | Fire, Police | 480,000 | 191,563 | 673,733 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 50, 22S | Yes |
| New York, N. Y. .. | 6,930,446 | S-C | 99 | * | 29,000,000 | 17,000,000 | 21,778,000 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 55 or 35S | * |
| Philadelphia, Pa. .. | 1,950,961 | C | 100 | All | 750,000 | 250,000 | 700,000 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | No |
| Pittsburgh, Pa. .... | 669,817 | S-C | 75 | * | 335,000 | 141,757 | 388,431 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | 60 | No |
| St. Louis, Mo. .... | 821,960 | S | 33⅓ | Fire, Police | 527,651 | 226,732 | 438,274 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | * | * |
| San Francisco, Calif.. | 634,394 | C | 95 | All | 2,006,625 | 734,066 | 1,610,935 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 57, 30S* | * |
| ***200,000 to 500,000*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Akron, Ohio ...... | 255,040 | C | 30 | Fire, Police | 90,000 | None | 90,000 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 25S | No |
| Atlanta, Ga. ...... | 270,366 | S | 37 | All | 130,176 | 45,819 | 169,676 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 25S | No |
| Birmingham, Ala. .. | 259,678 | S | 66⅔ | Fire, Police | 60,113 | 6,519 | 55,795 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 50 | No |
| Cincinnati, Ohio .... | 451,160 | S-O | 100 | All | 140,808* | 143,876* | 158,203* | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Columbus, Ohio .... | 290,564 | S | 100 | All | 291,561 | None | 291,561 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 65,30S* | No |
| Dallas, Tex. ....... | 260,475 | C | 33⅓ | Fire, Police | 100,460 | 10,137 | 110,597 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 20S | No |
| Dayton, Ohio ...... | 200,982 | S | 33⅓ | Fire, Police | 93,600 | None | 97,256 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 25S | No |
| Denver, Colo. ...... | 287,861 | S | 35 | Fire, Police | 31,247 | 16,742 | 47,841 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 70 or 20S | No |
| Houston, Tex. .... | 292,352 | C | 100 | All | 100,000 | None* | None* | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Jersey City, N. J. .. | 316,715 | O | 95 | All | 595,000 | * | 847,868 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60* | No |
| Louisville, Ky. .... | 307,745 | S-C | 25 | Fire, Police | 114,075 | 4,771 | 130,052 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | ... | No |

## Table VI.—Retirement Systems in Cities Over 30,000—Continued

| City | Population 1930 | Established by Statute (S), Charter (C), Ordinance (O) | Employees Included | | Amount Contributed to Fund in 1934 | | Amount Paid in Benefits in 1934 | Benefits Allowed | | | | | Minimum Retirement Age or Service in Years (S) | Actuarial Reserve |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Per Cent of Total | Classes of Employees | By City | By Employees | | Old Age Retirement | Death Ordinary | Death In Line of Duty | Disability Ordinary | Disability In Line of Duty | | |
| ***200,000 to 500,000—continued*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Memphis, Tenn. .... | 253,143 | C | .. | Fire, Police | $40,294 | None | ... | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | 20S | No |
| Minneapolis, Minn. . | 464,356 | S | 100 | All* | 736,259 | $229,796 | $746,057 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | * | No |
| Newark, N. J. ....... | 442,337 | S | 52 | All | 537,619 | 169,735 | 887,685 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 50* | No |
| New Orleans, La. .. | 458,762 | S | 26 | Fire, Police | 48,678 | 73,476 | 195,142 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | * | No |
| Oakland, Calif. .... | 284,063 | C | 35 | Fire, Police | 77,599 | 63,692 | 141,292 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | * | No |
| Omaha, Neb. ....... | 214,006 | S-C | 76 | * | 275,000 | 6,540 | 275,000 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 50 | No |
| Portland, Ore. .... | 301,815 | C | 50 | Fire, Police | 115,800 | 32,486 | 240,954 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 50, 20S | No |
| Providence, R. I. .... | 252,981 | S | 100 | All | 245,000 | 250,647 | 118,372 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes |
| Rochester, N. Y. .... | 328,132 | S | 36 | * | 147,094 | 153,535 | 214,109 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| St. Paul, Minn. .... | 271,606 | S | 100 | All | 135,822* | 24,062* | 216,930 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | ... | No |
| San Antonio, Texas.. | 231,542 | S-C | 34 | Fire, Police | 16,000 | 8,647 | 28,689 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 20S | No |
| Seattle, Wash. ....... | 365,583 | S-C | 100 | All | 396,000 | 240,000 | 180,000 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 70 | * |
| Syracuse, N. Y. .... | 209,326 | S | .. | * | 79,863 | 79,580 | 55,698 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Toledo, Ohio ...... | 290,718 | C | 42 | Fire, Police | 162,619 | None | 162,619 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | None | No |
| Washington, D. C. .. | 486,869 | S | 100 | All | 738,084 | 1,233,677 | 1,214,219 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 70, 15S | Yes |
| ***100,000 to 200,000*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Albany, N. Y. .... | 127,412 | S | 39 | * | 39,581 | 48,682 | 25,458 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Bridgeport, Conn. .. | 146,716 | C | 53 | Fire, Police | 106,623 | 31,214 | 111,933 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | No |
| Camden, N. J. ..... | 118,700 | S | 50 | Fire, Police | 150,000 | 15,000 | 150,000 | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | 50, 20S | Yes |
| Canton, Ohio ...... | 104,906 | S | 33⅓ | Fire, Police | 32,397 | None | 65,656 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 15S | No |
| Des Moines, Ia. .... | 142,559 | S | 40 | Fire, Police | 110,000 | 7,000 | 96,430 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 52 or 22S | Yes |
| Duluth, Minn. .... | 101,463 | * | 95 | All | ..... | ..... | ... | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | 65, 20S* | Yes |
| Elizabeth, N. J. .... | 114,589 | S | 50 | Fire, Police | 30,536 | 15,268 | 99,817 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 65 | No |
| El Paso, Tex. .... | 102,421 | S-C | 38 | Fire, Police | 16,352 | 3,345 | 19,688 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 20S | No |
| Erie, Pa. .......... | 115,967 | O | 33⅓ | Fire, Police | 3,750 | 3,534 | 19,092 | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | * | No |
| Evansville, Ind. .... | 102,249 | S | 52 | Fire, Police | 32,013 | 4,825 | 51,613 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 20S | No |
| Flint, Mich. ...... | 156,492 | C | 44 | Fire, Police | None | 2,417 | 13,050 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 25S | Yes |
| Fort Wayne, Ind. .. | 114,946 | S | .. | Fire, Police | 27,678 | 5,729 | 56,560 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | None | No |
| Fort Worth, Tex. .. | 163,447 | O* | 42 | Fire, Police | 10,000 | None | 10,000 | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes | None | No |
| Gary, Ind. ....... | 100,426 | S | 50 | Fire, Police | 10,282 | 4,000 | 5,640 | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 25S | Yes |
| Grand Rapids, Mich. | 168,592 | C | 40 | Fire, Police | 31,690 | None | 31,690 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 55 | No |
| Hartford, Conn. .... | 164,072 | C | 100 | All | 123,111 | 13,062 | 138,942 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 60 | No |
| Jacksonville, Fla. .. | 129,549 | O | 100 | All | 137,000 | 26,516 | 148,741 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 55, 20S* | No |
| Knoxville, Tenn. .. | 105,802 | C | 66 | All | 40,000 | 28,612 | 48,543 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 50 | No |
| Long Beach, Calif. .. | 142,032 | C | 25 | Fire, Police | 16,050 | 16,050 | 37,500 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 20S | No |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lynn, Mass. | 102,320 | S | 75 | [illegible] | 103,424 | None | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] |
| Miami, Fla. | 110,637 | S | 30 | Fire, Police | None | 11,410 | 7,937 | Yes | No | No | No | No | 20S | No |
| New Haven, Conn. | 162,655 | C | 56 | Fire, Police | 112,200 | 28,946 | 141,410 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60, 25S | No |
| Norfolk, Va. | 129,710 | O | 50 | Fire, Police | 41,034 | 22,895 | 63,773 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | 65 | No |
| Oklahoma City, Okla. | 185,389 | S | 20 | Fire | None* | 3,325* | 30,190 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 20S | No |
| Peoria, Ill. | 104,969 | S. | 50 | Fire, Police | 65,292 | 11,471 | 78,515 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 55 | * |
| Reading, Pa. | 111,171 | O | 12½ | Police | 2,500 | 2,381 | 4,060 | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | 50, 20S | Yes |
| Salt Lake City, Utah | 140,267 | O | 10 | Police | 12,458 | None | 12,458 | Yes | No | No | No | No | 60, 20S | No |
| San Diego, Calif. | 147,995 | C | 90 | All | 66,104 | 55,517 | 112,007 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | 62, 10S | * |
| Scranton, Pa. | 143,433 | S | 17.8 | * | 14,000 | 6,629 | 17,493 | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | 60, 20S | No |
| Somerville, Mass. | 103,908 | S | 30 | * | 25,335 | 18,822 | 9,164 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | * | Yes |
| South Bend, Ind. | 104,193 | S | 65 | Fire, Police | 23,870 | 3,569 | 40,233 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 20S | Yes |
| Spokane, Wash. | 115,514 | S | 33 | Fire, Police | 70,433 | 12,911 | 83,142 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | * | No |
| Springfield, Mass. | 149,900 | S-O | 92 | * | 98,793 | None | 98,793 | Yes | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | No |
| Tacoma, Wash. | 106,817 | S | 30 | Fire, Police | 39,423 | 15,210 | 72,197 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 55 | No |
| Tampa, Fla. | 101,161 | S | 27 | Fire, Police | 49,573 | 3,900 | 70,572 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 55 | Yes |
| Trenton, N. J. | 123,356 | S | 25 | Fire, Police | 43,931 | 21,966 | 141,494 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 50, 20S | No |
| Tulsa, Okla. | 141,258 | S-C | 25 | Fire | None* | None* | 18,200 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 20S | No |
| Utica, N. Y. | 101,740 | S | .. | * | 80,900 | 39,187 | 18,995 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Wichita, Kans. | 111,110 | S | 60 | Fire, Police | 15,000 | 1,200 | 24,342 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | None | No |
| Wilmington, Del. | 106,597 | O | 40 | Fire, Police | 10,000 | 6,002 | 36,840 | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | 20S | No |
| Worcester, Mass. | 195,311 | S | 100 | All | 68,029 | 67,105 | 28,100 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Yonkers, N. Y. | 134,646 | S | 32 | * | 103,765 | 111,096 | 102,199 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| ***30,000 to 100,000*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alameda, Calif. | 35,033 | O | .. | Fire, Police | ..... | ..... | ... | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 25S | Yes |
| Allentown, Pa. | 92,563 | O | 100 | All | 16,495 | 7,102 | 24,088 | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | 55 | No |
| Alton, Ill. | 30,151 | S | 50 | Fire, Police | ..... | ..... | 8,400 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 20S | Yes |
| Altoona, Pa. | 82,054 | S-O | 100 | All | 36,615 | 9,173 | 21,363 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 65 | Yes |
| Asheville, N. C. | 50,193 | O | 100 | All | 3,476 | None | 3,476 | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | ... | No |
| Auburn, N. Y. | 36,652 | S | 72 | All* | 34,641 | 7,406 | 9,169 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Baton Rouge, La. | 30,729 | S | 20 | Fire* | 1,049 | 561 | None | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | None | No |
| Bay City, Mich. | 47,355 | S-C | 30 | Fire, Police | 14,000 | None | 14,000 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | None | No |
| Bellingham, Wash. | 30,823 | S | 25 | Fire, Police | 1,710 | 1,826 | 7,828 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | No |
| Berkeley, Calif. | 82,109 | O | 38 | Fire, Police | 13,843 | None | 13,843 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 55, 25S | No |
| Bethlehem, Pa. | 57,892 | O | 40 | Police | None | 2,710 | 5,675 | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | 65 | No |
| Binghamton, N. Y. | 76,662 | S | 33* | * | 33,751 | 33,443 | 20,181 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Bloomfield, N. J. | 38,077 | S | .. | Fire, Police | 10,784 | 5,524 | 12,078 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 20S | No |
| Brookline, Mass. | 47,490 | O | 100 | All | 33,484 | 15,851 | 2,535 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Butte, Montana | 39,532 | S | 60 | Fire, Police | 9,000* | 800* | 7,560* | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | 20S | ... |
| Cedar Rapids, Iowa | 56,097 | S | .. | Fire, Police | ..... | ..... | .... | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 55 | Yes |
| Charleston, S. C. | 62,265 | O | .. | Fire, Police | ..... | ..... | .... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Chelsea, Mass. | 45,816 | S | 100 | All | 10,188 | 8,009 | 5,728 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Chester, Pa. | 59,164 | S | 25 | Police | 800 | ..... | ... | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | 65 | No |
| Chicopee, Mass. | 43,930 | S-C | .. | * | None | ..... | .... | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 25S | Yes |

## TABLE VI.—RETIREMENT SYSTEMS IN CITIES OVER 30,000—Continued

| City | Population 1930 | Established by Statute (S), Charter (C), Ordinance (O) | Employees Included |  | Amount Contributed to Fund in 1934 |  | Amount Paid in Benefits in 1934 | Benefits Allowed |  |  |  |  | Minimum Retirement Age or Service in Years (S) | Actuarial Reserve |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | Per Cent of Total | Classes of Employees | By City | By Employees |  | Old Age Retirement | Death Ordinary | Death In Line of Duty | Disability Ordinary | Disability In Line of Duty |  |  |
| ***30,000 to 100,000—continued*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cleveland Hghts., O. | 50,945 | S | 33⅓ | Fire, Police | None | $1,237 | $257 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 25S | Yes |
| Clifton, N. J. . . . . . . | 46,875 | S | 55 | Fire, Police | $12,526 | 6,475 | 6,064 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 50, 20S | No |
| Colo. Springs, Colo. . | 33,237 | C | 20 | Fire, Police | None | 1,887 | 8,705 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 or 20S | No |
| Council Bluffs, Iowa. | 42,048 | S | 38 | Fire, Police | 15,705 | 1,422 | 17,597 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 50 | No* |
| Covington, Ky. . . . . | 65,252 | . . | 25 | Fire, Police | . . . . . | . . . . . | 19,355 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 15S | Yes |
| Dearborn, Mich. . . . | 50,358 | O | 40 | Fire, Police | 50,000 | 9,364 | 3,926 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 25S | Yes |
| Decatur, Ill. . . . . . . . | 57,510 | S | 46 | Fire, Police | 13,370 | 1,615 | 24,535 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 20S | No |
| Dubuque, Iowa . . . . | 41,679 | S | 50 | Fire, Police | 28,004 | 1,493 | 29,497 | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 55 | Yes* |
| East Chicago, Ind. . . | 54,784 | S | 45 | Fire, Police | 27,785 | 1,887 | 8,696 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 20S | No |
| East Cleveland, Ohio. | 39,667 | S | 53 | Fire, Police | 10,213 | 1,270 | 1,239 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 25S | No |
| Easton, Pa. . . . . . . . . | 34,468 | S-O | . . | Fire, Police | 3,500 | 1,902 | 8,053 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60, 20S | No |
| East Orange, N. J. . . | 68,020 | S | 39 | Fire, Police | 20,467 | 10,874 | 70,972 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 65 | No |
| Elgin, Ill. . . . . . . . . . | 35,929 | O | 35 | Fire, Police | 12,726 | 804 | 27,411 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 50 | No |
| Elkhart, Ind. . . . . . . | 32,949 | S | 55 | Fire, Police | None | 1,173 | 7,956 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 20S | No |
| Elmira, N. Y. . . . . . . | 47,397 | S | 28 | * | 11,364 | 10,681 | 7,418 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Evanston, Ill. . . . . . . | 63,338 | S | 34 | Fire, Police | 30,169 | 3,139 | 35,203 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | None | No |
| Everett, Wash. . . . . . | 30,567 | S | 30 | Fire, Police | 9,480 | 1,620 | 11,998 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 60 | No |
| Fitchburg, Mass. . . . | 40,692 | C | 45 | * | 30,420 | None | 30,420 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 70 | No |
| Fort Smith, Ark. . . . | 31,429 | S | 33⅓ | Fire | None* | None* | 1,300 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 or 20S | No |
| Fresno, Calif. . . . . . | 52,513 | O | 43 | Fire, Police | 19,021 | 13,021 | 37,468 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 20S | Yes |
| Green Bay, Wis. . . . . | 37,415 | S | 50 | Fire, Police | 4,000 | 1,706 | 16,486 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 22S | No |
| Hamilton, Ohio . . . | 52,176 | S-C | 33⅓ | Fire, Police | 22,709 | None | 22,709 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 25S | No |
| Hammond, Ind. . . . | 64,560 | S | 50 | Fire, Police | 4,564 | 2,212 | 14,582 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | None | Yes |
| Hamtramck, Mich. . | 56,268 | C | 30 | Fire, Police | 6,644 | None | 6,644 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 25S | No |
| Harrisburg, Pa. . . . . | 80,339 | S-O | 80 | All | 8,000 | 11,526 | 22,045 | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | 65, 20S | No |
| Haverhill, Mass. . . . | 48,710 | S | 25 | * | 29,159 | None | 29,159 | Yes | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | No |
| Highland Pk., Mich. . | 52,959 | C | 21 | Fire, Police | 13,000 | 8,053 | 8,923 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 20S | No |
| High Point, N. C. . . . | 36,745 | S | 56 | Fire, Police | None* | None* | 630 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 50, 20S | No |
| Hoboken, N. J. . . . . . | 59,261 | S | 64 | Fire, Police | 102,443 | 17,400 | 132,692 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 65 | No |
| Holyoke, Mass. . . . . | 56,537 | S | 75 | * | 62,571 | None | 62,571 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | 65, 25S | No |
| Huntington, W. Va. . | 75,572 | O | 80 | Fire, Police | 2,000 | 2,400 | 7,427 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 23S | Yes |
| Irvington, N. J. . . . . . | 56,733 | O | 60 | Fire, Police | 14,416 | 6,805 | 11,000 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 65 | No |
| Jackson, Mich. . . . . . | 55,187 | O | 31 | Fire, Police* | 4,877 | None | 4,877 | Yes | No | No | No | No | 25S | No |
| Jackson, Miss. . . . . . | 48,282 | O | 34 | Fire, Police | 3,578 | 1,161 | 1,800 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 20S | No |
| Jamestown, N. Y. . . . | 45,155 | S | . . | Fire* | 8,943 | 9,517 | 10,712 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Joplin, Mo. . . . . . . . | 33,454 | C | 35 | Fire, Police | None | 3,000 | 4,500 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 20S | Yes |
| Kalamazoo, Mich. . . | 54,786 | O | 64 | Fire, Police | 3,379 | None | 3,379 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | None | No |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kearny, N. J. ...... | 40,716 | S | 57 | Fire, Police | 17,724 | 8,942 | 21,174 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 20S | No |
| Kenosha, Wis. ..... | 50,262 | S | 40 | Fire, Police | 1,500 | 2,899 | 14,269 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 22S | No |
| Kokomo, Ind. ..... | 32,843 | S | 50 | Fire, Police | 9,145 | 834 | 12,477 | Yes | No | No | No | No | 20S | Yes |
| La Crosse, Wis..... | 39,614 | S | 25 | Fire, Police | 11,000 | 1,998 | 25,391 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 22S | No |
| Lakewood, Ohio ... | 70,509 | S | 34 | Fire, Police | 2,000 | 1,122 | 7,879 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 25S | Yes |
| Lawrence, Mass. ... | 85,068 | S | 20 | Fire, Police | 44,037 | None | 44,037 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | .. | No |
| Lewiston, Me. ..... | 34,948 | C | 16⅔ | Fire, Police | 5,000 | None | 5,000 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 65 or 30S | No |
| Lexington, Ky. .... | 45,736 | S | 40 | Fire, Police | 11,579 | 2,513 | 23,188 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 20S | No |
| Lima, Ohio ....... | 42,287 | S | 30 | Fire, Police | 12,297 | None | 11,511 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 20S | No |
| Lincoln, Nebr. ..... | 75,933 | S | .. | Fire | 10,408 | None | 10,408 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 21S | No |
| Little Rock, Ark.... | 81,679 | S | 50 | Fire, Police | 13,000* | None | 26,456 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | .. | No |
| Lorain, Ohio ...... | 44,512 | S | 45 | Fire, Police | 6,500 | None | 22,000 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 20S | No |
| McKeesport, Pa. ... | 54,632 | S | 33⅓ | Fire, Police | 1,200 | 2,388 | 9,164 | Yes | ... | ... | ... | ... | 55, 20S | No |
| Macon, Ga. ....... | 53,829 | S-C | 65 | Fire, Police | 8,356 | None | 8,356 | Yes | No | No | No | No | 25S | No |
| Madison, Wis. ..... | 57,899 | S | 10 | Fire, Police | 10,256* | 2,796 | 23,403 | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | ... | Yes |
| Malden, Mass. ..... | 58,036 | S | 90 | * | 65,000 | None | 65,000 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 65 | No |
| Manchester, N. H... | 76,834 | O | 100 | All* | 54,213 | None | 54,213 | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | 20S | No |
| Mansfield, Ohio ... | 33,525 | O | 35 | Fire, Police | 16,638 | None | 16,518 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 22S | No |
| Marion, Ohio ..... | 31,084 | S | 30 | Fire, Police | 4,280 | None | 8,192 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes |
| Montgomery, Ala. .. | 66,079 | .. | .. | Fire, Police | ..... | ..... | ... | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 55 | No |
| Mt. Vernon, N. Y... | 61,499 | S | 41 | * | 18,173 | 16,907 | 12,235 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Muncie, Ind. ...... | 46,548 | S | 50 | Fire, Police | 7,800 | 500 | 19,030 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 20S | No |
| Muskogee, Okla. ... | 32,026 | S | 20 | Fire | None* | None* | 10,715 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes* | 20S | No |
| Nashua, N. H...... | 31,463 | S | 100 | All | 5,135 | None | 5,135 | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | 20S | No |
| Newark, Ohio ..... | 30,596 | S | 33 | Fire, Police | 16,070 | None | 16,151 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 55,20S | No |
| New Britain, Conn.. | 68,128 | .. | .. | Fire, Police | 6,000 | * | ... | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | None | Yes |
| New Brunswick, N. J. | 34,555 | S | 33 | Fire, Police | ..... | ..... | ... | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | 65 | Yes |
| Newburgh, N. Y.... | 31,275 | S | .. | * | 7,496 | 7,631 | 1,234 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| New Castle, Pa..... | 48,674 | O | 20 | Fire | None* | None* | ... | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 55, 20S | No |
| New Rochelle, N. Y.. | 54,000 | S | 28 | * | 20,870 | 22,338 | 14,382 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Niagara Falls, N. Y.. | 75,460 | S | 35 | * | 19,287 | 20,657 | 17,489 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Norwalk, Conn. ... | 36,019 | C | 20 | Fire, Police | None | 5,114 | 2,413 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 60 | No |
| Oak Park, Ill. ..... | 63,982 | S | 43 | Fire, Police | None | 4,840 | 13,834 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | No |
| Ogden, Utah ...... | 40,272 | S | 24 | Police* | 5,776 | None | 5,776 | Yes | No | No | No | No | 60,20S | No |
| Orange, N. J....... | 35,399 | S | 66⅔ | Fire, Police | ..... | ..... | .... | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | ... | 62 | No |
| Oshkosh, Wis. ..... | 40,108 | S | 20 | Fire, Police | 12,000 | 12,505 | 21,681 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 62 | No |
| Pasadena, Calif. .... | 76,086 | C | 19 | Fire, Police | 28,930 | None* | 39,229 | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 55 | No* |
| Passaic, N. J....... | 62,959 | S | 40 | Fire, Police | 22,942 | 11,471 | 53,693 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 65 | No |
| Pensacola, Fla. ..... | 31,579 | C | 100 | All | 6,000 | None | 6,000 | Yes | Yes* | Yes* | Yes | Yes | 20S | No |
| Perth Amboy, N. J.. | 43,516 | S | .. | Fire, Police | 10,000 | ..... | .... | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 65 | Yes |
| Pittsfield, Mass. .... | 49,677 | O | 33⅓ | Fire, Police | 13,583 | None | 13,583 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | 60 | No |
| Plainfield, N. J...... | 34,422 | S | 60 | Fire, Police | 13,000 | 6,500 | 18,395 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 65 | No |
| Port Huron, Mich... | 31,361 | C | 40 | Fire, Police | None* | 172 | None* | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 25S | ... |
| Portland, Me. ...... | 70,810 | S | 49 | Fire, Police | 49,215 | None | 49,215 | Yes | No | No | No | No | 65 or 25S | No |
| Portsmouth, Ohio .. | 42,560 | S | 33 | Fire, Police | 9,000 | None | 9,000 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 15S | No |
| Portsmouth, Va. ... | 45,704 | O | 24 | Fire, Police | 11,620 | * | 11,504 | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |

## Table VI.—Retirement Systems in Cities Over 30,000—Continued

| City | Population 1930 | Established by Statute (S), Charter (C), Ordinance (O) | Employees Included | | Amount Contributed to Fund in 1934 | | Amount Paid in Benefits in 1934 | Benefits Allowed | | | | | Minimum Retirement Age or Service in Years (S) | Actuarial Reserve |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Per Cent of Total | Classes of Employees | By City | By Employees | | Old Age Retirement | Death Ordinary | Death In Line of Duty | Disability Ordinary | Disability In Line of Duty | | |
| ***30,000 to 100,000—continued*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poughkeepsie, N. Y. | 40,288 | S | .. | All* | $17,363 | $15,510 | $7,349 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Pueblo, Colo. | 50,096 | S | 48 | Fire, Police | 6,000 | 1,786 | 24,571 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | 55 | No |
| Quincy, Ill. | 39,241 | S | 50 | Fire, Police | None | * | 24,000 | Yes | No | No | No | No | 20S | No |
| Racine, Wis. | 67,542 | S-C | 32 | Fire, Police | 10,700 | 2,719 | 44,423 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 22S | No |
| Revere, Mass. | 35,680 | O | .. | * | ..... | ..... | .... | Yes | No | No | No | No | 65 | ... |
| Richmond, Ind. | 32,493 | S | .. | Fire, Police | 9,865 | 864 | 12,456 | Yes | No | No | No | No | 20S | Yes |
| Roanoke, Va. | 69,206 | O | 34 | Fire, Police | 5,895 | 2,534 | 8,429 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 70 | No |
| Rockford, Ill. | 85,864 | S | 23 | Fire, Police | 19,307 | 2,723 | 38,734 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 50, 20S | No |
| Rome, N. Y. | 32,338 | S | 52 | All* | 18,797 | 5,540 | 4,074 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Sacramento, Calif. | 93,750 | C | 85 | All | None* | None* | None* | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | * | Yes |
| Saginaw, Mich. | 80,715 | C | 50 | Fire, Police | 21,255 | None | 20,464 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 25S | Yes |
| St. Joseph, Mo. | 80,835 | S-C | 51 | Fire, Police | 2,363 | 3,581 | 21,544 | Yes | No | * | * | Yes | * | No |
| St. Petersburg, Fla. | 40,425 | O | 12 | Fire, Police | 17,919 | 1,122 | 10,908 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Salem, Mass. | 43,353 | C | .. | * | ..... | ..... | .... | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | ... | ... |
| San Jose, Calif. | 57,651 | C-O* | 100 | All | 9,039 | 2,662 | 8,360 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 55 | No |
| Santa Barbara, Calif. | 33,613 | C | 21 | Fire, Police | 6,200 | None | 6,200 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 20S | No |
| Savannah, Ga. | 85,024 | S | 85 | All | 26,665 | 15,500 | None | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | 60, 25S | ... |
| Schenectady, N. Y. | 95,692 | S | .. | * | 32,230 | 39,058 | 28,267 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Sheboygan, Wis. | 39,251 | S | 16½ | Fire, Police | 4,676 | 1,817 | 12,203 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | * | No |
| Shreveport, La. | 76,655 | S | 60 | Fire, Police | 4,038 | 2,699 | 28,404 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 20S | No |
| Sioux City, Iowa | 79,183 | S | 33⅓ | Fire, Police | 21,606 | 2,891 | 36,127 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 50 | Yes |
| Sioux Falls, S. D. | 33,362 | O | 100 | All | 5,000* | None | 6,968 | Yes | No | ... | Yes | Yes | 60 | No |
| Springfield, Ill. | 71,864 | S | .. | Fire, Police | * | * | 42,429 | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 20S | ... |
| Springfield, Ohio | 68,743 | O | 27 | Fire, Police | 27,500 | None | 29,350 | No | * | Yes | * | Yes | ... | No |
| Stamford, Conn. | 46,346 | C | 33⅓ | Fire, Police | 18,509 | 3,394 | 25,270 | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 25S | No |
| Steubenville, Ohio | 35,422 | O | 25 | Fire, Police | 15,819 | None | 15,313 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 20S | No |
| Stockton, Calif. | 47,963 | O | 29 | Fire, Police | None* | 16,286 | 19,111 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | * | Yes |
| Superior, Wis. | 36,113 | S | 41 | Fire, Police | 53,025 | 1,963 | 53,813 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | 22S | Yes |
| Topeka, Kans. | 64,120 | S-O | 100 | All | 12,098 | 1,804 | 25,111 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | * | No |
| Troy, N. Y. | 72,763 | S | 12 | * | 14,305 | 11,041 | 4,661 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Tucson, Ariz. | 32,506 | C* | 28 | Fire, Police | 9,963 | 4,138 | None | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | * | Yes |
| Union City, N. J. | 58,659 | S | 50 | Fire, Police | 56,600 | 12,622 | 73,854 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 50, 20S | No |
| Waco, Tex. | 52,848 | C | 47 | Fire, Police | 5,356 | None | 5,356 | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | 25S | No |
| Waltham, Mass. | 39,247 | S | 75 | * | 31,985 | None | 32,247 | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | * | No |
| Warren, Ohio | 41,062 | O | 25 | Fire, Police | 6,000 | 738 | 7,284 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Waterbury, Conn. | 99,902 | C | 100 | All | 26,283 | 2,382 | 30,237 | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | * | No |
| Waterloo, Iowa | 46,191 | S | 37 | Fire, Police | 11,087 | 1,314 | 12,940 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 50, 22S | No |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Watertown, Mass. .. | 34,913 | S | 80 | * | 13,950 | None | None | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | . . . | No |
| Watertown, N. Y.... | 32,205 | S | 100 | All* | 30,105 | 25,607 | 20,124 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 60 | Yes |
| Waukegan, Ill. .... | 33,499 | S | 40 | Fire, Police | 6,235 | 784 | 14,760 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 50 | No |
| West Allis, Wis..... | 34,671 | O | 30 | Fire, Police | None | 1,786 | 3,315 | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | 23S | No |
| Wheeling, W. Va.... | 61,659 | S | 48 | Fire, Police | None* | 1,964 | 14,702 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 50 | No |
| Williamsport, Pa. .. | 45,729 | O | 20 | Police | 1,181 | 956 | 3,594 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | 25S | No |
| York, Pa. ......... | 55,254 | S | 33⅓ | Police | 2,350 | 2,350 | None* | Yes | No | No | No | No | 55 | Yes |

## Cities Reporting No Retirement System

The 39 cities reporting no retirement system are: *200,000 to 500,000*—Kansas City, Missouri. *100,000 to 200,000*—Richmond, Virginia. *30,000 to 100,000*—Amarillo, Texas; Aurora, Illinois; Austin, Texas; Beaumont, Texas; Berwyn, Illinois; Charleston, West Virginia; Charlotte, North Carolina; Columbia, South Carolina; Columbus, Georgia; Cranston, Rhode Island; Cumberland, Maryland; Danville, Illinois; Durham, North Carolina; Galveston, Texas; Glendale, California; Greensboro, North Carolina; Hagerstown, Maryland; Lancaster, Pennsylvania; Lansing, Michigan; Laredo, Texas; Lynchburg, Virginia; Meridian, Mississippi; Moline, Illinois; Muskegon, Michigan; Newport News, Virginia; Norwood, Ohio; Paducah, Kentucky; Pontiac, Michigan; Port Arthur, Texas; Quincy, Massachusetts; Raleigh, North Carolina; Rock Island, Illinois; San Bernardino, California; Santa Ana, California; Santa Monica, California; Wichita Falls, Texas; Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

## Notes on Retirement Systems in Cities Over 30,000

(An asterisk in the table refers to notes below; cities in alphabetical order without regard to population.)

Albany, New York: All employees of the city except firemen and policemen are covered by the retirement system administered by the state comptroller. The figures in the table refer to these employees only. Members of the fire and police departments are covered by a retirement system administered by the city for which data are not available.

Altoona, Pennsylvania: This retirement system is carried fully or in part with a private insurance company.

Auburn, New York: All classes of employees are covered by the system administered by the state comptroller.

Baton Rouge, Louisiana: The city also carries group insurance for firemen and policemen. The fire and police chiefs are insured for $4,000 and each member of the fire and police departments for $2,000.

Binghamton, New York: All employees except fire and police are covered by the system administered by the state comptroller. Data for this system only are included in this table. In addition, the city operates a retirement system for fire and police as required by the city charter. Ninety-five per cent of all city employees are covered by these two systems.

Buffalo, New York: All employees except fire and police are covered by the retirement system administered by the state comptroller. In addition, firemen and policemen are covered by a retirement system administered by the city as required by charter. Practically all city employees are covered by the two systems.

Butte, Montana: Figures for contributions to and benefits paid out of the pension fund do not include the data for the fire department relief association, which were not available.

Chicopee, Massachusetts: This retirement system covers only firemen, policemen, and laborers.

Cincinnati, Ohio: Cincinnati has three retirement systems, one for general employees, one for firemen, and one for policemen. Figures in the table for contributions and benefits are for the general retirement system only.

Columbus, Ohio: Firemen and policemen may retire after 25 years of continuous service.

Council Bluffs, Iowa: A state law enacted in March, 1934, places all employees in fire and police departments who are appointed after the passage of the law under a retirement system based on an actuarial reserve.

Detroit, Michigan: The retirement system covers all classes of employees except employees in the library and the street railway system.

Dubuque, Iowa: The retirement system is on an actuarial basis for employees hired after July 1, 1934.

Duluth, Minnesota: City employees are members of the state retirement system established by state law and adopted by the city commission. Employees may also retire after 35 years of service without regard for age.

Elmira, New York: All employees except fire and police are covered by the system administered by the state comptroller. Members of the fire and police departments are covered by a retirement system required by statute and administered by the city. Ninety per cent of all employees are covered by these two systems. Data in the table refer to the state-administered system only.

Erie, Pennsylvania: Members of the police force may retire after 20 years' service, while firemen may retire at the age of 55 after 25 years' service.

Fitchburg, Massachusetts: The retirement system covers only the employees of the fire, police, public works, and water departments.

Fort Smith, Arkansas: All revenue for the retirement fund is derived from the state-administered locally-shared tax on fire insurance.

Fort Worth, Texas: The retirement system for the fire and police departments is partially suspended at present.

Haverhill, Massachusetts: The retirement system covers employees of fire, police, street, and water departments.

High Point, North Carolina: One dollar of the cost in all civil cases in the municipal court is contributed to the retirement fund. This sum has been sufficient to meet expenses and benefits paid from the fund. City and employee contributions are unnecessary.

Holyoke, Massachusetts: Retirement system covers employees of public works, fire, and police departments.

Houston, Texas: The retirement system was established by a charter amendment in 1933 and is not yet in full operation.

## NOTES ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS IN CITIES OVER 30,000—Continued.

(An asterisk in Table VI refers to notes below; cities in alphabetical order without regard to population.)

**Jackson, Michigan:** The retirement system also covers a few employees in the pumping station.

**Jacksonville, Florida:** Employees of the fire department are retired at the age of 65 and employees of the police department only after 20 years of service.

**Jamestown, New York:** Employees of the fire department are members of the system administered by the state comptroller.

**Jersey City, New Jersey:** Employees contribute to the retirement fund from 2 to 3 per cent of their salaries. Members of the fire and police departments may retire at the age of 50.

**Little Rock, Arkansas:** The retirement fund also received $7,086 from a state-administered locally-shared tax on fire insurance.

**Lynn, Massachusetts:** The retirement system covers policemen, firemen, and laborers.

**Madison, Wisconsin:** The fund received $6,206 in 1934 from a state-administered locally-shared tax on fire insurance.

**Malden, Massachusetts:** Retirement system covers policemen, firemen, and laborers.

**Manchester, New Hampshire:** Follows the policy of retiring all employees at the discretion of department heads and the mayor and council.

**Minneapolis, Minnesota:** Three retirement systems are in effect: one for policemen, one for firemen, and one for all other city employees. Contributions and benefits for all three retirement systems have been lumped together in the table. The minimum retirement age for policemen and firemen is set at 50, and for other city employees at 60 for women and 62 for men. None of the systems are based on an actuarial reserve, although it is reported that the city system is partially so.

**Mount Vernon, New York:** All city employees except firemen and policemen are members of the retirement system administered by the state comptroller. The firemen and policemen are members of a system administered by the city which is not on an actuarial basis and for which city contributions amounted to $42,538 and benefits paid out to $35,031. Data in the table are for the state system only.

**Muskogee, Oklahoma:** All revenue for the firemen's retirement fund comes from a state-administered locally-shared tax on fire insurance. In addition the city carries liability insurance in a private company for all city employees for which it paid approximately $5,400 in 1934.

**Newark, New Jersey:** Four retirement systems are in effect, benefits and contributions from which are lumped together in the table. Policemen and firemen may retire at the age of 50; health department employees are retired after 25 years of service.

**New Britain, Connecticut:** Employees contribute 2 per cent of their salaries to the retirement fund, the exact total amount not being available.

**Newburgh, New York:** All city employees except police are covered by the system administered by the state comptroller.

**New Castle, Pennsylvania:** All revenue for the firemen's retirement fund is derived from a state-administered locally-shared tax on fire insurance.

**New Orleans, Louisiana:** Policemen may retire after 16 years' service, and firemen after 20 years' service.

**New Rochelle, New York:** All city employees except fire and police are members of the system administered by the state comptroller. Members of the fire and police departments are covered by a retirement system administered by the city, and approximately 95 per cent of all city employees are covered by one or the other system.

**New York City:** Twelve retirement systems are in effect which cover all classes of employees except librarians. Figures in the table are lumped together for the twelve systems and are approximations only. The two largest systems are reported to be on an actuarial basis.

**Niagara Falls, New York:** All employees except fire and police are members of the retirement system administered by the state comptroller. Firemen and policemen are covered by a separate retirement system administered by the city. Practically all city employees are covered by one or the other of these two systems. Figures in the table refer to the state retirement system only.

**Oakland, California:** Firemen may retire at the age of 55 after 25 years of service. Policemen may retire at the age of 60 after 20 years of service.

**Ogden, Utah:** Police and fire departments are covered by a state-administered pension system; 46 per cent of all city employees are covered by these two systems. Figures in the table refer to the city-administered system for policemen only.

**Oklahoma City, Oklahoma:** The retirement fund for firemen received $22,999 in 1934 from a state-administered locally-shared tax on fire insurance.

**Omaha, Nebraska:** The retirement system covers firemen, policemen, and employees of the library.

**Pasadena, California:** A new charter amendment effective July 1, 1935, provides for an actuarial reserve and for contributions by employees of the fire and police departments.

**Pensacola, Florida:** Death benefits are provided by group insurance.

**Peoria, Illinois:** The police retirement system is on an actuarial basis but the system for the fire department is not.

**Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania:** All classes of the employees are covered by the retirement system with the exception of day laborers.

**Port Huron, Michigan:** This retirement system went into effect on December 1, 1934, which accounts for the fact that no benefits were paid out during the year.

**Portsmouth, Virginia:** Employees contributed to the retirement fund in 1934 one per cent of their salaries, the total figure for which is not available.

**Poughkeepsie, New York:** All employees are members of the retirement system administered by the state comptroller.

**Quincy, Illinois:** Employees contributed to the pension fund in 1934 one per cent of their salaries, the total figure not being available.

**Revere, Massachusetts:** The retirement system covers policemen, firemen, and laborers. Data as to contributions and benefits paid from the fund were not available.

**Rochester, New York:** All city employees except members of the fire and police departments are covered by the system administered by the state comptroller. Firemen and policemen are covered by a system administered by the city. Eighty-five per cent of all employees are covered by the two systems.

**Rome, New York:** All classes of city employees are covered by the system administered by the state comptroller.

Sacramento, California: The retirement system established by charter amendment became effective March 15, 1935. The minimum retirement age is fixed at 60 for policemen and firemen and 65 for other city employees.

St. Joseph, Missouri: Pays funeral expenses only for death in line of duty, medical expenses only for ordinary disability, before retirement. Firemen are retired after 22 years of service and policemen after 25 years.

St. Louis, Missouri: Policemen may retire at the age of 60 after 30 years of service, firemen may retire after 20 years of service. The police fund is on an actuarial basis but the firemen's fund is not.

St. Paul, Minnesota: Four retirement systems are in effect, the figures for which are lumped in the table. The firemen's retirement system received $33,086 in state aid.

Salem, Massachusetts: The retirement system covers policemen, firemen, and laborers.

San Diego, California: Three retirement systems are in effect, figures for which are lumped in the table. The system for city employees is on an actuarial basis while the fire and police systems are not.

San Francisco, California: Firemen may retire after 25 years of service or at the age of 55 after 20 years of service. The retirement system is on an actuarial basis for a few employees only.

San Jose, California: The retirement system for the fire and police department is required by charter and for other city employees by city ordinance.

Schenectady, New York: All city employees except firemen and policemen are covered by the retirement system administered by the state comptroller.

Scranton, Pennsylvania: The retirement system reported in the table covers officials and clerks and some per diem employees. A system is also operated for the fire and police forces but data were not available. Of all city employees, 56.7 per cent are covered by one or the other of these two systems.

Seattle, Washington: The retirement system is on an actuarial basis for all city employees except for firemen and policemen.

Sheboygan, Wisconsin: Policemen may retire after 22 years of service, and firemen at the age of 60.

Sioux Falls, South Dakota: The firemen's retirement system receives revenue from the state-administered locally-shared tax on fire insurance.

Somerville, Massachusetts: The retirement system covers all new employees since January 1, 1931. Policemen and firemen may retire at the age of 65, all other city employees at the age of 70.

Spokane, Washington: Firemen may retire at the age of 55 after 20 years of service, and policemen at the age of 60 after 20 years of service.

Springfield, Illinois: Revenue for the retirement fund in 1934 was $47,658. It is not known how this amount was split between the city's and the employees' contributions.

Springfield, Massachusetts: The retirement system is required by state law to cover policemen, firemen, laborers, and janitors; it also covers certain other employees by ordinance.

Springfield, Ohio: Benefits are allowed for ordinary death or disability before retirement if the employee has served 20 years.

Stockton, California: The city's contribution to the retirement fund is normally approximately $30,000 per year, but nothing was paid during 1934 because the matter was tied up in litigation. Policemen may retire at the age of 60 and firemen at the age of 55.

Syracuse, New York: All employees except fire and police are covered by the retirement system administered by the state comptroller. Firemen and policemen are covered by a system administered by the city and required by charter. Figures in the table are for the state system only. Nearly all employees are covered by these systems.

Topeka, Kansas: Firemen and policemen may retire at the age of 50 after 20 years of service; all other city employees may retire at the age of 55 after 20 years of service.

Troy, New York: All employees except firemen and police are covered by the system administered by the state comptroller. Policemen and firemen are covered by a retirement system administered by the city. Practically all employees are covered by these two systems.

Tucson, Arizona: Firemen may retire at the age of 60 and policemen at the age of 65. This system is carried with a private insurance company.

Tulsa, Oklahoma: All revenue for the retirement fund is derived from the state-administered locally-shared tax on fire insurance.

Utica, New York: All city employees except police are covered by the system administered by the state comptroller.

Waltham, Massachusetts: The retirement system covers policemen, firemen, and laborers. Policemen and firemen may retire after 25 years of service; others may retire at the age of 65 after 25 years of service, or at the age of 60 after 25 years of service when incapacitated.

Waterbury, Connecticut: Firemen may retire at the age of 55 after 20 years of service; policemen at the age of 65 after 25 years of service; and all others at the age of 60 after 25 years of service.

Watertown, Massachusetts: The retirement system covers firemen, policemen, and laborers.

Watertown, New York: All city employees are covered by the retirement system administered by the state comptroller.

Wheeling, West Virginia: The city formerly contributed to the fund by means of a special tax levy, but this levy was eliminated in 1934 as a result of the constitutional tax limitation.

Yonkers, New York: All city employees except fire and police are covered by the system administered by the state comptroller. Firemen and policemen are covered by a retirement system administered by the city. Approximately 100 per cent of all employees are covered by the two systems.

York, Pennsylvania: The retirement system does not become active until the fund contains $50,000 net.

# Professional Organizations of Municipal Officials

By Robert M. Paige

*Assistant Director, Public Administration Clearing House, Chicago*

NATIONAL organizations of those who have the same economic and professional interests are found today in practically every industry, business, and occupation. The public service is no exception to this rule. State, county, municipal, and school employees have formed at least one hundred national organizations. These associations of public officials, like the associations of those in the fields of private endeavor, perform the useful service of bringing their members into closer co-operation for mutual advancement, keeping them in touch with progressive developments in their respective professions, and developing and maintaining professional standards.

The public service is a complex of many different services, some of the most important of which are exclusively the concern of governments. This means that to exchange experiences and ideas with those who have the same problems and responsibilities, the principal public officials—police or fire chiefs, tax assessors, or school superintendents, for example—must get in touch with officials in other cities and in other states. In a small or medium-sized town there are few if any persons with whom such officials can "talk shop." Because this is true, organizations of public officials are especially necessary and their value in bringing together the members of relatively small and widely scattered professions is generally recognized.

Another fact which makes these national organizations peculiarily useful is the decentralization of government in this country. Here, voluntary associations of public officials provide many of the services which in other countries would be the responsibility of the central government. These associations not only arrange conferences, publish news letters and magazines; but also maintain permanent secretariats which answer inquiries, develop training courses, provide a placement or employment service for members, and formulate cost standards for various municipal functions. As interesting examples of the work of these voluntary associations one might cite: the system of uniform crime reporting developed by a committee of the International Association of Chiefs of Police and now being administered by the United States Department of Justice; the system of uniform reporting of public works services and costs developed by a joint committee of the American Society of Municipal Engineers and the International Association of Public Works Officials; the standard appraisal forms worked out by the American Public Health Association; the study of municipal accounting looking toward the development of greater uniformity of accounts initiated during the past year under the auspices of the Municipal Finance Officers' Association; and the Institute for Training in Municipal Administration established in 1934 by the International City Managers' Association.

Nineteen national associations composed of as many different types of municipal officials have been selected for inclusion in this YEAR BOOK. These organizations include the principal municipal officers; a directory of these officials in cities of over 10,000 appears elsewhere in this YEAR BOOK. Other organizations of municipal employees, and all organizations of county and state officials are listed and described in *A Directory of Organizations in the Field of Public Administration,* published in 1934 by the Public Administration Clearing House. Only the organizations of chief officials who are usually appointed are discussed in this article.

It is significant that five of the nineteen organizations described below were formed during the past five years. Furthermore in addition to these five groups, four others opened headquarters offices with full-time staffs during this period. Thus there are nine important groups of municipal officials which have had all of the advantages of a strong national association for only a few years. It will be interesting to watch the progress of these newer organizations and to compare their contributions to the advancement of the profession of public administration with the contributions which have been made by such well established associations as those of the school superintendents, public health officers, and librarians.

The organizations have been listed in order of their establishment. Each descriptive statement gives the date of organization, the name of the secretary, the address to which correspondence should be directed, the number of members, purposes and activities (including in a few instances a statement of important accomplishments during 1934), and the titles of the magazines and other periodicals published by the group.

### DEPARTMENT OF SUPERINTENDENCE, NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION (1870)

*Executive Secretary:* Sherwood D. Shankland, 1201 16 Street, Washington, D. C.

*Membership:* 4,000 educators holding supervisory and administrative positions with state, county, and city school systems.

*Purposes and Activities:* Serves as a national professional organization of school executives; co-operates with the research division of the National Education Association in maintaining an educational research service through which superintendents may receive individual assistance by means of bibliographies, reports, and statistical tabulations on problems encountered in the administration of local school systems; holds an annual meeting with some 30 other departments of the N. E. A.

*Publications:* Official report of convention proceedings, $1. "Yearbook," $2. Each yearbook contains the report of a special commission. Subjects of recent yearbooks have been: "Character Education," 1932; "Educational Leadership: Progress and Possibilities," 1933; "Critical Problems in School Administration," 1934; "Social Change and Education," 1935.

### AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION (1872)

*Executive Secretary:* Reginald M. Atwater, M. D., 50 West 50 Street, New York City.

*Membership:* 5,000 professional public health workers; about two-thirds of the members are officials of state and municipal health departments.

*Purposes and Activities:* Carries on educational, field, employment, informational, research, and other services designed to protect and promote public and personal health; seeks to develop and maintain high professional standards in the public health profession; holds annual meeting; is at present engaged in a study of the minimum training and qualifications essential for health officers, sanitary inspectors, and public health nurses (this will eventually be extended to include every type of health worker).

*Publications:* "American Journal of Public Health," monthly, $5.

### INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FIRE CHIEFS (1873)

*Headquarters Manager:* Fred Shepperd, 24 West 40 Street, New York City.

*Membership:* 1,231 fire chiefs; 1,122 associate and honorary members representing firemen, city officials, insurance companies, firms, and corporations interested in fire protection and fire fighting.

*Purposes and Activities:* Provides information service; prepares courses of instruction for fire training schools; serves as clearing house for information on problems of fire protection; holds an annual meeting.

*Publications:* Proceedings of annual meeting.

### AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION (1876)

*Secretary:* Carl H. Milam, 520 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago.

*Membership:* 12,500 librarians and libraries; most of the members are employed by publicly supported institutions.

*Purposes and Activities:* Maintains advisory and informational services; carries on a comprehensive research program; makes field surveys; maintains committees on all phases of library administration. Major accomplishment during 1934 was the preparation of a national plan for libraries and advancement of state library planning on which library leaders in 42 states and the District of Columbia are now at work.

*Publications:* "Bulletin," monthly.

### AMERICAN WATER WORKS ASSOCIATION (1881)

*Secretary:* Beekman C. Little, 29 West 39 Street, New York City.

*Membership:* 2,400 superintendents of municipal and private water works, engineers, chemists, bacteriologists, and other qualified persons interested in the advancement of knowledge relating to water supply.

*Purposes and Activities:* Carries on studies and research projects in water works design, construction, and operation; maintains committees on water works practice, standard methods of water analysis, finance and accounting, plant management, and water purification; holds annual and regional meetings. A major activity during 1934 was the distribution of information on water works construction under PWA.

*Publications:* "Journal," monthly, $7.

### INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE (1893)

*Secretary:* George Black, city hall, Wilmington, Delaware.

*Membership:* 500 superintendents and chiefs of police, town marshals, and chiefs of detectives.

*Purposes and Activities:* Works to advance the police profession, the science of prevention and detection of crime, and the apprehension of criminals; advises with police departments in the installation of record systems and the preparation of crime reports; holds an annual meeting.

*Publications:* "Police Chiefs' News Letter," monthly, $1.

### AMERICAN SOCIETY OF MUNICIPAL ENGINEERS (1894)

*Executive Director:* Donald C. Stone, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago.

*Membership:* 850 professional engineers who hold positions in departments of municipal, county, or state governments, or who are regularly engaged as engineering consultants by cities and other public bodies.

*Purposes and Activities:* Promotes best methods in the management of municipal engineering departments and in the construction of municipal public works; serves as a clearing house and service bureau for municipal engineers and public works officials on such problems as: street paving, design, construction and maintenance; street lighting; traffic control; airports; sewerage and sanitation; refuse disposal and street cleaning; construction and operation of water works and other public utilities; prepares research reports; holds an annual meeting in conjunction with International Association of Public Works Officials; during 1934 laid plans for establishing in co-operation with the International Association of Public Works Officials a joint secretariat with a full-time staff.

*Publications:* "Public Works Engineers News Letter," monthly; "Proceedings," $3.

### AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PARK EXECUTIVES (1898)

*Executive Secretary:* William H. Walker, 1829 Portage Avenue, South Bend, Indiana.

*Membership:* 400 executives and assistant executives of public parks and recreation systems.

*Purposes and Activities:* Promotes co-operation among park executives and the study of such problems as: park design and park maintenance, operation of playgrounds and recreation programs, conservation of wild life, city planning in relation to parks and boulevards, training of park executives, national and state parks, zoölogical exhibits.

*Publications:* "Parks and Recreation," monthly, $3.

### CIVIL SERVICE ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA (1906)

*Executive Director:* G. Lyle Belsley, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago.

*Membership:* City, county, and state civil service commissions represented by commission members and commission secretaries; also public personnel directors and technicians and specialists in this field.

*Purposes and Activities:* Promotes co-operation among member agencies and research in all phases of personnel management; serves as a clearing house and service bureau for members; prepares model service examinations and facilitates the interchange of examinations and examination methods among public personnel agencies; holds an annual convention; during 1934 laid plans for the re-establishment early in 1935 of a headquarters office with full-time staff.

### MUNICIPAL FINANCE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION (1906)

*Executive Director:* Carl H. Chatters, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago.

*Membership:* 400 comptrollers, auditors, and other financial officers of municipalities, counties, and states, and private accountants and auditors specializing in municipal finance.

*Purposes and Activities:* Serves as a clearing house for financial information and as a service bureau for municipal finance authorities; conducts research in the administrative problems of municipal comptrollers and accountants; prepares accounting forms and manuals; co-operates with United States Bureau of the Census in compilation of financial statistics of local government; conducts special long-term studies on municipal revenues and functions, and municipal accounting and reporting; organized and directs the work of the temporary National Committee on Municipal Accounting; holds an annual meeting.

*Publications:* "Municipal Finance," quarterly, $1.50; "News Letter," semimonthly, $3.

### NATIONAL RECREATION ASSOCIATION (1906)

*Secretary:* Howard S. Braucher, 315 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

*Membership:* 7,500 playground and recreation workers and officials, and interested citizens.

*Purposes and Activities:* Gathers and distributes information relative to the administration of play and recreation programs and conducts research in these problems; renders advisory and consulting service by correspondence and field visits; conducts service bureaus including: Children's Playground Service, National Physical Education Service, Community Recreation Field Service (maintains regular district field workers who render service to cities); established National Recreation School for the training of playground and recreation directors.

*Publications:* "Recreation," monthly, $2.

### INTERNATIONAL CITY MANAGERS' ASSOCIATION (1914)

*Executive Director:* Clarence E. Ridley, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago.

*Membership:* 200 city managers of at least three years' standing (members); 100 city managers of less than three years' standing (associate members); 200 professional public administrators, students, and others.

*Purposes and Activities:* Aids in the improvement of local government administration; encourages city managers to administer the affairs of their cities in accordance with best methods developed through research and actual experience; offers limited consulting service; conducts Institute for Training in Municipal Administration which offers extension courses for training on the job; ascertains and records more significant developments in public administrative and managerial practice; holds annual meeting.

*Publications:* "Public Management," monthly, $4; "The Municipal Year Book," $4; "City Managers' News Letter," bi-weekly.

### GOVERNMENTAL GROUP, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PURCHASING AGENTS (1915)

*Secretary:* Earle Henderson, purchasing agent, Village of Winnetka, Illinois.

*Membership:* 150 purchasing agents employed by municipalities and states.

*Purposes and Activities:* Assists members in locating sources of supply; develops information on commodity markets and furnishes information on purchasing problems; exchanges data relating to prices, specifications, and tests; keeps members informed regarding all matters affecting governmental purchasing, such as NRA, processing taxes, etc.; suggests purchasing procedures. A major activity during 1934 was the clarification of NRA code restrictions and provisions relating to public bids.

### INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC WORKS OFFICIALS (1920)

*Executive Director:* Donald C. Stone, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago.

*Membership:* 200 city superintendents of public works, sanitation and street cleaning, city engineers, and city commissioners of public works.

*Purposes and Activities:* Serves as clearing house for all public works problems particularly those involving the operation and maintenance of public works and public utilities, the collection and disposal of refuse, street cleaning, and snow removal; conducts research; collects cost and operating data on various public works activities; holds annual meeting in conjunction with American Society of Municipal Engineers; during 1934 laid plans for establishing, in co-operation with the A. S. M. E., a joint secretariat with a full-time staff.

*Publications:* "Public Works Engineers News Letter," monthly, $1; proceedings of annual meeting, $3.

### AMERICAN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSOCIATION (1930)

*Executive Director:* Frank Bane, 850 East 58 Street Chicago.

*Membership:* 3,200 public welfare officials.

*Purposes and Activities:* Seeks to develop and maintain high standards of public welfare work; provides consultant and advisory service to city, county, and state public welfare departments and institutions; advocates and is prepared to assist state officials in carrying out comprehensive revision and modernization of public welfare laws; fosters co-operation between federal departments and administrations concerned with public welfare and emergency relief, and state and local welfare officials.

*Publications:* "Public Welfare News," monthly, $1.

### NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOUSING OFFICIALS (1933)

*Executive Director:* Coleman Woodbury, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago.

*Membership:* Members of state housing boards, federal, state and local housing authorities, and other public officials directly concerned with low-cost housing, slum clearance, subsistence homesteads, and allied problems; private citizens who are interested in low-cost housing (associate members).

*Purposes and Activities:* Serves as a clearing house of information for public officials concerned with the planning and administration of low-cost housing projects, rural and urban; aids in the development of administrative standards and sound procedures for the supervision, construction and operation of housing projects under public or governmental auspices; major accomplishment during 1934 was preparation, with the assistance of European housing experts, of a "Housing Program for America."

*Publications:* "The Housing Yearbook."

### American Society of Planning Officials (1934)

*Executive Director:* Walter H. Blucher, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago.

*Membership:* Members of city and county planning and zoning boards and commissions; members of state, regional and national planning boards; and the secretaries, executive officers, technicians, and consulting engineers employed by official planning agencies.

*Purposes and Activities:* Serves as a clearing house for planning problems and information and as a service bureau for planning officials; prepares pamphlets and manuals to guide and assist planning officials in their technical work; holds an annual meeting and arranges regional and sectional meetings.

*Publications:* "News Letter," monthly.

### National Association of Tax Assessing Officers (1934)

*Executive Director:* Carl H. Chatters; associate director: Albert W. Noonan, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago.

*Membership:* Officers of cities, townships, counties, and states responsible for tax administration and the assessment of property for taxation.

*Purposes and Activities:* Works to improve assessment practices; assists members by answering inquiries, and furnishing assessment manuals and other helpful material on assessing techniques; conducts research projects and special studies; holds an annual convention.

*Publications:* "Municipal Finance," quarterly, $1.50; "News Letter," monthly.

### Institute of Municipal Law Officers (1934)

*Executive Director:* Paul V. Betters, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago.

*Membership:* Corporation counsels and other municipal law officers.

*Purposes and Activities:* Promotes co-operation among municipal law officers and the interchange of model ordinances and court decisions relating to the powers and duties of municipal corporations.

*Publications:* "United States Municipal News," publication of the United States Conference of Mayors, is giving special attention to news of interest to law officers.

# The City Manager Profession and Directory

SEVENTY-NINE city manager appointments were made in 1934; fifty or 63 per cent had previously held some public position and thirty-five of the fifty were appointed directly from the public service. Of these fifty appointments, five city managers received promotions to another city and sixteen former city managers returned to active service in the profession. Twenty-two appointments represented local promotions from the administrative staff of the city while seven men were drawn from administrative positions in other jurisdictions.

Table 1

Comparison of City Manager Appointments 1930-1934

| | 1930 | 1931 | 1932 | 1933 | 1934 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Promotions from administrative staff within city | 25 | 31 | 30 | 26 | 22 |
| Promotions from administrative positions outside city | 10 | 13 | 14 | 9 | 7 |
| Entering from non-governmental positions | 23 | 22 | 31 | 44 | 20 |
| Promotions from one city to another | 17 | 18 | 8 | 3 | 5 |
| Former managers receiving appointments | 7 | 11 | 5 | 9 | 16 |
| Unknown | | | | | 9 |
| Total appointments | 82 | 95 | 88 | 91 | 79 |
| Number of out-of-town appointments | 36 | 39 | 25 | 15 | 25 |
| Per cent of out-of-town to total | 44 | 41 | 28 | 17 | 32 |

Appointments from public positions outside the city consisted of two assistant city managers who were elevated to manager positions, one CWA engineer, one District of Columbia engineer, one member of a provincial streams commission in Canada, one state highway commissioner, one United States Collector of Internal Revenue. Local promotions from the administrative staff of the city to the post of city manager were received by six city clerks, four city engineers, three water works superintendents, one city auditor, one health officer, one tax collector, one superintendent of maintenance, one police chief, one refuse collector, one port commissioner, one mayor, and one councilman.

Twenty appointments were made in 1934 from non-governmental positions, of which 13 were business men, 6 were engineers, and one was an accountant. The previous occupations of nine appointees are unknown.

Twenty-five managers appointed in 1934 were out-of-town men. This amounted to 32 per cent of all appointments as compared with 17 per cent in 1933, 28 per cent in 1932, 41 per cent in 1931, and 44 per cent in

1930. Five of the ten cities and counties which appointed their first managers in 1934 went outside the city, three of them selecting experienced city managers. Of the 89 cities and counties in which the council-manager plan was made effective some time during the years 1929 to 1934 inclusive, 63 or 71 per cent appointed out-of-town men to be the first managers.

### TABLE 2

### COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF CITIES SERVED BY MANAGERS IN SERVICE AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1929-34

| Number of Cities Served | Number of Managers in Service December 31[1] | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1930 | 1931 | 1932 | 1933 | 1934 |
| One | 326 | 324 | 345 | 362 | 356 |
| Two | 53 | 53 | 54 | 56 | 64 |
| Three | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 17 |
| Four | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Five | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Six | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Seven | ... | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | 401 | 402 | 424 | 440 | 442 |

[1] The total number of managers in service at the end of each year does not represent the total number of manager cities as there are always some vacant positions. Managers who have served the same city twice at different periods are counted as having served different cities. There were 20 such cases at end of 1934.

The five city managers promoted from one city to another during the year made a total of 222 promotions in the city manager profession since 1908, the year the plan was first adopted. Sixty-seven or approximately one-third of all these promotions occurred in the six-year period 1929 to 1934. Promotions from one city to another and the appointment of former managers to new positions are reflected in Table 2 which shows that at the end of 1934, 86 managers were serving in their second, third, fourth, fifth, or seventh cities, as compared with 78 in 1933 and 79 in 1932.

### TABLE 3

### AVERAGE LENGTH OF SERVICE OF 442 CITY MANAGERS INCLUDING ALL CITIES SERVED

| End of year | Average for All City Managers in the Service |
|---|---|
| 1915 | 1 year, 7 months |
| 1920 | 2 years, 1 month |
| 1925 | 3 years, 4 months |
| 1930 | 4 years, 11 months |
| 1934 | 5 years, 9 months |

*Length of service.* The average length of service of the 442 city managers holding office at the end of 1934 was five years and nine months, including all cities served. This represents an increase of two years and five months over the average length of service of managers holding office at the end of 1925 as shown by Table 3.

Of these 442 city managers, 102 or 23.1 per cent have served less than two years; 155 or 35.1 per cent from two to five years inclusive; 185 or 41.8 per cent have served six years or more including all cities served; and 81 or 18.3 per cent have held office as manager for ten years or more.

TABLE 4

LENGTH OF SERVICE OF MANAGERS INCLUDING ALL CITIES SERVED AS OF DECEMBER 31

| Completed Service in Years | Number of Managers in Service | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1930 | 1931 | 1932 | 1933 | 1934 |
| Less than 1 | 35 | 50 | 50 | 52 | 40 |
| 1 | 64 | 46 | 65 | 51 | 62 |
| 2 | 56 | 48 | 36 | 61 | 44 |
| 3 | 42 | 44 | 40 | 37 | 53 |
| 4 | 36 | 35 | 40 | 35 | 26 |
| 5 | 37 | 31 | 27 | 36 | 32 |
| 6 | 24 | 35 | 26 | 26 | 34 |
| 7 | 28 | 22 | 35 | 21 | 25 |
| 8 | 19 | 22 | 14 | 31 | 18 |
| 9 | 12 | 11 | 25 | 13 | 27 |
| 10 | 16 | 12 | 14 | 21 | 11 |
| 11 | 8 | 12 | 10 | 14 | 22 |
| 12 | 13 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 11 |
| 13 | 4 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 9 |
| 14 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 8 |
| 15 and over | 3 | 5 | 12 | 15 | 20 |
| | 401 | 402 | 424 | 440 | 442 |

A comparison with previous periods shows that the percentage of city managers with a total service of three years or more increased from 48 per cent in 1925, to 61 per cent in 1930, and to 67 per cent in 1934.

*Separations from the service.* During the year, 64 managers resigned or were removed by the council, and two died, making a total of 66 separations, as compared to 72 in 1933, 62 in 1932, and 67 in 1931. Of the 64 men who left city-manager positions in 1934, 16 received appointments to other public positions: four with FERA and one with PWA; four entered the service of state governments—two were appointed to executive positions in state planning boards; one as a state director of finance; and one in a state highway department; seven took positions with local governments—one as assistant city manager, one as city auditor, two with local water departments, one as city clerk, one as engineer for a school district, and one as mayor.

Of the eleven who entered private professions two city managers joined civic research agencies—one as the secretary of a state municipal league, and the other as a staff member of a municipal research bureau; seven went into private engineering work; one into accountancy; and one began the practice of law. With respect to the occupation of the remaining 37 men who left city manager positions in 1934, 10 became engaged in business, 10 are at present unemployed, and the occupations of 17 are unknown.

## TABLE VII

## DIRECTORY OF APPROVED COUNCIL-MANAGER CITIES, AND CITY MANAGERS

### 444 CITIES AND 7 COUNTIES AS OF MARCH 1, 1935

The figure following the city indicates the number of city managers to date and in the column headed "Plan" the letter "C" indicates adoption of the plan by charter, "O" by ordinance. (M) after the manager's name indicates Member and (Assoc. M) Associate Member in the International City Managers' Association; the figure indicates he has served more than one city. A summary of 1934 developments in the city manager profession appears on the pages preceding this table. For other developments in council-manager government see page 114.

| City | Population 1930 | Plan | In Effect | Name of Manager | Year Appointed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ARIZONA | | | | | |
| Phoenix (14) | 48,118 | C | 1914 | Thomas M. Sullivan | 1934 |
| Tucson (3) | 32,506 | C | 1930 | R. E. Butler (M) | 1931 |
| ARKANSAS | | | | | |
| Marianna (1) | 4,314 | O | 1925 | C. C. Mitchener | 1926 |
| CALIFORNIA | | | | | |
| Alameda (5) | 35,033 | C | 1917 | Walter P. Koetitz (Assoc. M) | 1935 |
| Alhambra (8) | 29,472 | C | 1916 | O. S. Roen 3 | 1934 |
| Avalon (3) | 1,897 | O | 1919 | E. R. Pollok | 1931 |
| Bakersfield (7) | 26,015 | C | 1915 | Fred W. Nighbert | 1933 |
| Berkeley (2) | 82,109 | C | 1923 | Hollis R. Thompson (M) | 1930 |
| Burbank (3) | 16,662 | C | 1927 | H. I. Stites (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Chico (2) | 7,961 | C | 1923 | Harry H. Hume (M) | 1929 |
| Compton (7) | 12,516 | C | 1925 | A. B. Gidley (M) 2 | 1934 |
| Coronado (4) | 5,425 | O | 1920 | Edwin A. Ingham (M) | 1928 |
| Fillmore (1) | 2,893 | O | 1918 | Clarence Arrasmith | 1918 |
| Glendale (6) | 62,736 | C | 1914 | William V. Anderson (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Hillsborough (1) | 1,891 | C | 1928 | John C. Nowell (M) | 1928 |
| Long Beach (9) | 142,032 | C | 1921 | R. M. Dorton (M) 3 | 1934 |
| Monterey (2) | 9,141 | C | 1925 | B. J. Pardee (M) 2 | 1934 |
| Oakland (2) | 284,063 | C | 1931 | John F. Hassler (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Pacific Grove (2) | 5,558 | C | 1927 | Erwin Dames (M) | 1929 |
| Pasadena (4) | 76,086 | C | 1921 | C. W. Koiner (M) | 1933 |
| Porterville (3) | 5,303 | C | 1927 | F. M. Pfrimmer | 1934 |
| Redwood City (1) | 8,962 | C | 1929 | E. A. Rolison (M) 3 | 1929 |
| Richmond (1) | 20,093 | O | 1920 | J. A. McVittie (M) | 1920 |
| Sacramento (4) | 93,750 | C | 1921 | James S. Dean (M) | 1930 |
| Sacramento County (1) | 141,999 | C | 1933 | Charles W. Deterding, Jr | 1933 |
| San Diego (4) | 147,995 | C | 1932 | George L. Buck 2 | 1934 |
| San Jose (3) | 57,651 | C | 1916 | C. B. Goodwin (M) | 1920 |
| San Leandro (2) | 11,455 | C | 1928 | Allen E. Pelton | 1932 |
| San Mateo (3) | 13,444 | C | 1923 | E. P. Wilsey (M) | 1930 |
| San Mateo County (1) | 77,405 | C | 1933 | Walter T. Kellogg | 1933 |
| San Rafael (2) | 8,022 | O | 1915 | H. K. Brainerd (M) | 1921 |
| Santa Rosa (4) | 10,636 | C | 1923 | Fred Steiner | 1933 |
| So. Pasadena (4) | 13,730 | O | 1920 | Burton A. Garlinghouse | 1934 |
| Stockton (2) | 47,963 | C | 1923 | Walter B. Hogan (M) | 1928 |
| Tulare (4) | 6,207 | C | 1923 | W. M. Brown (Assoc. M) | 1931 |
| Upland (1) | 4,713 | O | 1930 | R. G. Manley (M) | 1930 |
| Ventura (2) | 11,603 | C | 1933 | Don C. McMillan | 1934 |
| Visalia (2) | 7,263 | C | 1923 | J. J. Philippe | 1933 |

| City | Population 1930 | Plan | In Effect | Name of Manager | Year Appointed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| COLORADO | | | | | |
| Boulder (5) | 11,223 | C | 1918 | Harold C. McClintock (Assoc. M) | 1932 |
| Colo. Springs (2) | 33,237 | C | 1921 | E. L. Mosley (M) | 1930 |
| Durango (3) | 5,400 | C | 1915 | W. H. Wigglesworth | 1929 |
| Grand Junction (3) | 10,247 | C | 1922 | J. P. Soderstrum (M) 2 | 1930 |
| Montrose (7) | 3,566 | C | 1914 | H. R. Elliott (M) | 1928 |
| CONNECTICUT | | | | | |
| New London (2) | 29,640 | C | 1921 | William A. Holt (M) | 1923 |
| Stratford (4) | 19,212 | C | 1921 | William H. Shea (Assoc. M) | 1935 |
| DELAWARE | | | | | |
| Dover (1) | 4,800 | C | 1929 | L. D. Shank (M) | 1929 |
| Milford (1) | 3,719 | C | 1932 | Charles E. Banning (M) | 1932 |
| FLORIDA | | | | | |
| Bartow (5) | 5,269 | C | 1922 | C. S. James | 1933 |
| Clearwater (4) | 7,607 | C | 1923 | A. C. Nichols | 1934 |
| Coral Gables (3) | 5,697 | C | 1925 | E. M. Williams (M) | 1931 |
| Daytona Beach (9) | 16,598 | C | 1922 | M. S. Couch | 1934 |
| DeLand (2) | 5,246 | C | 1926 | Grant Bly (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Dunedin (2) | 1,435 | C | 1926 | W. Lovett Douglas | 1928 |
| Fernandina (3) | 3,023 | C | 1923 | Russell A. Smith | 1929 |
| Ft. Lauderdale (6) | 8,666 | C | 1925 | Robert M. Kerr (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Ft. Meade (6) | 1,981 | C | 1925 | Wilma D. Murdaugh | 1934 |
| Ft. Pierce (8) | 4,803 | C | 1923 | E. G. Gustafson | 1933 |
| Gainesville (3) | 10,465 | C | 1921 | George H. Cairns 2 | 1934 |
| Haines City (4) | 3,037 | C | 1925 | R. E. Keagle | 1934 |
| Hollywood (10) | 2,869 | C | 1926 | M. S. Worland | 1933 |
| Kissimmee (4) | 3,163 | C | 1923 | Edward Newton | 1928 |
| Lakeland (5) | 18,554 | C | 1914 | Charles Larsen (M) | 1931 |
| Largo (9) | 1,429 | C | 1913 | Finley McMullen | 1930 |
| Leesburg (2) | 4,113 | C | 1923 | O. Raymond Skiles (M) | 1931 |
| Melbourne (5) | 2,677 | C | 1926 | Charles R. Stickel (Assoc. M) | 1934 |
| Miami (5) | 110,637 | C | 1921 | L. L. Lee (Assoc. M) | 1931 |
| Miami Beach (2) | 6,494 | O | 1923 | Claude A. Renshaw (M) | 1925 |
| Moore Haven (4) | 612 | C | 1925 | J. R. Dowd | 1933 |
| New Smyrna (6) | 4,149 | C | 1921 | W. W. Gunn | 1932 |
| Ocala (9) | 7,281 | C | 1918 | E. P. Clark | 1934 |
| Palatka (3) | 6,500 | C | 1924 | R. M. Ingram, Jr | 1929 |
| Palm Beach (1) | 1,707 | C | 1922 | L. Trevette Lockwood (M) | 1922 |
| Pensacola (1) | 31,579 | C | 1931 | George J. Roark (M) 2 | 1931 |
| Plant City (5) | 6,800 | C | 1927 | G. H. Bates | 1934 |
| Polk City (6) | 222 | C | 1925 | W. T. Bridges | 1933 |
| Punta Gorda (4) | 1,833 | C | 1921 | John R. Jack, Sr. (M) | 1930 |
| Quincy (2) | 3,788 | C | 1923 | Steve Edwards | 1925 |
| St. Augustine (5) | 12,111 | C | 1915 | Eugene Masters (Assoc. M) | 1932 |
| St. Petersburg (2) | 40,425 | C | 1931 | Carleton F. Sharpe (Assoc. M) | 1934 |
| Sanford (4) | 10,100 | C | 1920 | F. S. Lamson, Acting | 1930 |
| Stuart (2) | 1,924 | O | 1926 | C. E. Schroeder | 1928 |
| Tallahassee (3) | 10,700 | C | 1920 | William R. Galt (M) 2 | 1924 |
| W. Palm Beach (7) | 26,610 | C | 1919 | Frank Hannon, Acting | 1934 |
| Winter Haven (7) | 7,130 | C | 1923 | W. W. Jamison | 1934 |
| GEORGIA | | | | | |
| Albany (2) | 14,507 | C | 1924 | C. Q. Wright (M) | 1925 |
| Brunswick (5) | 14,022 | C | 1921 | F. J. Torras (M) | 1931 |
| Cartersville (4) | 5,250 | C | 1917 | John W. Dent | 1932 |
| Columbus (4) | 43,131 | C | 1922 | Marshall Morton (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Cordele (2) | 6,880 | C | 1923 | John R. Brown | 1930 |
| Cornelia (4) | 1,542 | C | 1928 | V. C. Philyaw | 1934 |
| Decatur (3) | 13,276 | C | 1921 | A. F. Newman | 1935 |

GEORGIA (Continued)

| City | Population 1930 | Plan | In Effect | Name of Manager | Year Appointed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Eastman (2) | 3,022 | C | 1922 | M. C. Edwards | 1924 |
| Gainesville (4) | 8,624 | C | 1922 | Samuel C. Dunlap | 1933 |
| Griffin (3) | 10,321 | C | 1918 | H. P. Powell (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Quitman (4) | 4,149 | C | 1922 | R. W. Hunter | 1934 |
| Rome (2) | 21,843 | C | 1919 | O. M. Lanham (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Tifton (3) | 3,390 | C | 1921 | G. W. Coleman | 1933 |
| Toccoa (1) | 4,602 | C | 1932 | E. P. Bridges 2 | 1932 |
| Waycross (5) | 15,510 | C | 1923 | H. M. Pafford (Assoc. M) | 1935 |
| ILLINOIS | | | | | |
| Glencoe (2) | 6,295 | O | 1914 | George R. Young (M) | 1927 |
| Glenview (1) | 1,886 | O | 1931 | Edmund H. Waterhouse (Assoc. M) | 1932 |
| Kenilworth (1) | 2,501 | O | 1920 | F. L. Streed (M) | 1920 |
| Riverside (2) | 6,770 | O | 1925 | G. L. Opper (Assoc. M) | 1934 |
| Wilmette (3) | 15,233 | O | 1930 | Boyne H. Platt (Assoc. M) | 1934 |
| Winnetka (2) | 12,166 | O | 1915 | H. L. Woolhiser (M) | 1917 |
| IOWA | | | | | |
| Ames (2) | 10,261 | O | 1920 | John H. Ames (M) | 1927 |
| Clarinda (6) | 4,962 | O | 1913 | Warren D. Toyne (M) | 1927 |
| Dubuque (4) | 41,679 | C | 1920 | Roger M. Evans (M) 2 | 1930 |
| Iowa Falls (3) | 4,112 | O | 1914 | Floyd Klippel | 1931 |
| Maquoketa (4) | 3,595 | O | 1920 | J. H. Curtis (M) 2 | 1931 |
| Mason City (2) | 23,304 | C | 1927 | E. H. Crofoot (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Mt. Pleasant (1) | 3,743 | O | 1916 | T. W. McMillan | 1916 |
| Villisca (3) | 2,032 | O | 1919 | Edwin E. Jenkins | 1928 |
| Webster City (2) | 7,024 | C | 1915 | G. J. Long | 1917 |
| West Liberty (2) | 1,679 | O | 1920 | C. J. Mackey | 1928 |
| KANSAS | | | | | |
| Arkansas City (1) | 13,946 | C | 1931 | Clyde B. King 2 | 1931 |
| Atchison (2) | 13,024 | C | 1921 | A. W. Seng (M) 2 | 1927 |
| Belleville (2) | 2,383 | C | 1921 | G. C. Pierce | 1932 |
| El Dorado (6) | 10,311 | C | 1917 | F. E. Schide (Assoc. M) | 1931 |
| Hays (3) | 4,618 | C | 1919 | F. J. Haffamier | 1928 |
| Hoisington (2) | 3,001 | C | 1924 | Ralph B. Call | 1927 |
| Kinsley (4) | 2,270 | C | 1922 | W. H. Craft | 1932 |
| La Crosse (2) | 1,355 | C | 1925 | Jess C. Moser | 1926 |
| McCracken (3) | 594 | C | 1919 | J. I. Edwards | 1929 |
| Newton (3) | 11,034 | C | 1927 | Knowland L. Brode (M) | 1931 |
| St. Marys (4) | 1,304 | C | 1921 | M. E. Coleman | 1931 |
| Salina (4) | 20,155 | C | 1921 | Herbert L. Brown (M) | 1931 |
| Sterling (3) | 1,868 | C | 1925 | Robert Peart | 1934 |
| Stockton (2) | 1,291 | C | 1921 | O. M. Goodrich | 1922 |
| Wichita (4) | 111,110 | C | 1917 | Bert C. Wells (M) 3 | 1927 |
| Winfield (1) | 9,398 | C | 1921 | William J. Welfelt | 1921 |
| KENTUCKY | | | | | |
| Ashland (1) | 29,074 | C | 1934 | William G. Powell (Assoc. M) | 1934 |
| Covington (3) | 65,252 | C | 1932 | Theodore Kluemper | 1934 |
| Lexington (1) | 45,736 | C | 1932 | Paul Morton (M) 3 | 1932 |
| Newport (1) | 29,744 | C | 1932 | C. E. Wallingford (M) 2 | 1932 |
| Paducah (1) | 33,541 | C | 1934 | L. V. Bean (M) 2 | 1934 |
| MAINE | | | | | |
| Auburn (6) | 18,571 | C | 1918 | F. W. Ford, Jr. (M) | 1926 |
| Baileyville (1) | 2,017 | C | 1934 | C. B. MacIninch (Assoc. M) | 1934 |
| Bangor (1) | 28,794 | C | 1932 | James G. Wallace (M) | 1932 |
| Belfast (1) | 4,993 | C | 1930 | Harrie D. Eckler (M) | 1930 |
| Brewer (1) | 6,392 | C | 1932 | F. D. Farnsworth (M) 2 | 1932 |
| Camden (2) | 3,606 | C | 1925 | Percy Keller (Assoc. M) | 1932 |

### MAINE (Continued)

| City | Population 1930 | Plan | In Effect | Name of Manager | Year Appointed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dexter (1) | 4,063 | O | 1931 | Samuel B. Furbish | 1931 |
| Ellsworth (1) | 3,447 | C | 1934 | Melvin F. McFarland (Assoc. M) | 1934 |
| Ft. Fairfield (2) | 2,616 | C | 1929 | D. M. Allen | 1932 |
| Mt. Desert (1) | 2,022 | C | 1932 | Herbert A. Thomas 2 | 1932 |
| Portland (2) | 70,810 | C | 1923 | James E. Barlow (M) 3 | 1928 |
| Presque Isle (1) | 4,662 | C | 1933 | Frank T. Adams (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Rumford (4) | 8,726 | O | 1927 | Bion F. Jose | 1934 |
| South Portland (1) | 13,840 | C | 1934 | Harry A. Brinkerhoff (2) | 1934 |
| Washburn (2) | 1,974 | C | 1931 | Edward C. Peterson (Assoc. M) | 1934 |

### MASSACHUSETTS

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mansfield (4) | 6,364 | C | 1921 | Harold H. Everett (M) | 1928 |
| Middleboro (1) | 8,608 | C | 1921 | H. J. Goodale (M) | 1921 |
| Norwood (4) | 15,049 | C | 1915 | William C. Kendrick (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Stoughton (1) | 8,204 | C | 1922 | B. L. Winslow (M) | 1922 |

### MICHIGAN

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alma (3) | 6,734 | C | 1919 | J. Donald Sullivan | 1928 |
| Alpena (5) | 12,166 | C | 1916 | Arnold H. Hopperstead (Assoc. M) | 1934 |
| Bay City (4) | 47,355 | C | 1921 | George L. Lusk (Assoc. M) | 1928 |
| Benton Harbor (5) | 15,434 | C | 1921 | Harry H. Crow (Assoc. M) | 1934 |
| Big Rapids (4) | 4,671 | C | 1914 | Dan H. Vincent | 1918 |
| Birmingham (5) | 9,539 | C | 1918 | James W. Parry (M) | 1927 |
| Cadillac (3) | 9,570 | C | 1914 | George Johnston | 1918 |
| Crystal Falls (1) | 2,995 | C | 1917 | J. H. Sanders | 1917 |
| East Detroit (1) | 5,955 | C | 1929 | A. H. Arens, Acting | 1930 |
| Escanaba (2) | 14,524 | C | 1922 | Theo. F. Kessler (M) | 1926 |
| Ferndale (2) | 20,855 | C | 1924 | Jay F. Gibbs (M) | 1929 |
| Flint (5) | 156,492 | C | 1930 | John M. Barringer (Assoc. M) | 1932 |
| Gladstone (2) | 5,170 | C | 1923 | F. R. Buechner (M) 2 | 1924 |
| Grand Haven (5) | 8,345 | C | 1915 | P. A. Kammeraad (Assoc. M) | 1932 |
| Grand Rapids (5) | 168,592 | C | 1917 | C. Sophus Johnson (Assoc. M) | 1934 |
| Grosse Pte. Shores (4) | 621 | O | 1916 | Arthur H. Bennett (M) | 1923 |
| Harbor Springs (2) | 1,200 | C | 1932 | Max Van de Greyn (M) 2 | 1934 |
| Iron River (2) | 4,665 | C | 1926 | D. M. Youngs | 1930 |
| Ironwood (2) | 14,299 | C | 1925 | Dow I. Sears (M) | 1929 |
| Jackson (10) | 55,187 | C | 1915 | Philip E. Campbell | 1932 |
| Kalamazoo (5) | 54,786 | C | 1918 | Edward C. Rutz (M) | 1931 |
| Kingsford (3) | 5,526 | C | 1924 | Egnar S. Anderson | 1933 |
| Lapeer (3) | 5,008 | C | 1919 | A. W. Cox | 1931 |
| Marysville (2) | 1,405 | C | 1920 | Edward C. Guck, Acting | |
| Manistee (4) | 8,078 | C | 1914 | Otto M. Damrow (M) | 1927 |
| Manistique (3) | 5,198 | C | 1926 | Frank W. Voisine | 1934 |
| Mt. Pleasant (3) | 5,211 | C | 1921 | W. K. Willman (M) 2 | 1930 |
| Muskegon (4) | 41,390 | C | 1920 | Carl H. Peterson (M) 3 | 1934 |
| Muskegon Hgts. (4) | 15,584 | C | 1922 | George F. Liddle (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Oak Pk. (5) | 1,079 | C | 1927 | Nelson G. Lyons | 1933 |
| Otsego (5) | 3,245 | C | 1918 | (Vacancy) | |
| Petoskey (6) | 5,740 | C | 1916 | P. T. Mitchell (M) 2 | 1925 |
| Pleasant Ridge (2) | 2,885 | C | 1919 | A. J. Berst (Assoc. M) | 1926 |
| Plymouth (5) | 4,484 | C | 1918 | L. P. Cookingham (M) 2 | 1931 |
| Pontiac (6) | 64,928 | C | 1920 | W. P. Edmonson | 1933 |
| Portland (1) | 1,902 | C | 1919 | F. L. Jenkins (Assoc. M) | 1919 |
| Royal Oak (5) | 22,904 | C | 1917 | E. M. Shafter (M) | 1931 |
| St. Johns (2) | 3,929 | C | 1919 | Theo. H. Townsend | 1919 |
| St. Joseph (1) | 8,349 | C | 1928 | H. G. Crow (M) | 1929 |
| Sault Ste. Marie (3) | 13,755 | C | 1917 | Henry A. Sherman (M) | 1920 |
| Stambaugh (1) | 2,400 | C | 1924 | Charles A. Nelson | 1924 |
| Sturgis (6) | 6,950 | C | 1921 | Lloyd Waterstraut | 1932 |
| Three Rivers (3) | 6,863 | C | 1918 | O. O. Johnson 2 | 1930 |

## MINNESOTA

| City | Population 1930 | Plan | In Effect | Name of Manager | Year Appointed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Albert Lea (2) | 10,169 | C | 1929 | R. L. Van Nocker (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Anoka (3) | 4,851 | C | 1914 | Wayne Ridge | 1931 |
| Columbia Hgts. (5) | 5,613 | C | 1921 | James McKenna | 1930 |
| Morris (4) | 2,474 | C | 1914 | John A. Mielke | 1930 |
| White Bear Lake (4) | 2,600 | C | 1921 | William Holzheid | 1928 |
| **MISSOURI** | | | | | |
| Excelsior Springs (7) | 4,565 | C | 1922 | Bernard S. Alnutt (M) | 1931 |
| Kansas City (1) | 399,746 | C | 1926 | H. F. McElroy | 1926 |
| Maryville (3) | 5,217 | C | 1919 | O. L. Robey | 1933 |
| **MONTANA** | | | | | |
| Bozeman (3) | 6,855 | C | 1921 | G. O. Arnold (M) | 1929 |
| **NEBRASKA** | | | | | |
| Alliance (4) | 6,669 | C | 1919 | Earl D. Mallery (Assoc. M) | 1932 |
| Douglas County | 232,982 | C | 1937 | | |
| **NEW JERSEY** | | | | | |
| Asbury Park (2) | 14,981 | C | 1933 | Carl H. Bischoff (Assoc. M) 2 | 1934 |
| Cape May (3) | 2,637 | C | 1924 | R. B. Dean | 1932 |
| Clifton (1) | 46,875 | C | 1934 | William A. Miller (Assoc. M) | 1934 |
| Hackensack (1) | 24,568 | C | 1933 | Wilder M. Rich (M) 5 | 1933 |
| Keansburg (3) | 2,190 | C | 1925 | Clinton B. Lohsen | 1927 |
| Teaneck (1) | 16,513 | C | 1930 | Paul A. Volcker (M) 2 | 1930 |
| **NEW MEXICO** | | | | | |
| Albuquerque (6) | 26,570 | C | 1918 | Charles E. Wells | 1934 |
| Clayton (6) | 2,518 | O | 1921 | J. H. Bender (M) 3 | 1934 |
| Clovis (7) | 8,027 | C | 1922 | John C. Luikart | 1933 |
| Roswell (3) | 11,173 | O | 1914 | Clyde D. Fulton | 1920 |
| **NEW YORK** | | | | | |
| Auburn (3) | 36,652 | C | 1920 | William B. Patterson (Assoc. M) | 1932 |
| Binghamton (1) | 76,662 | C | 1932 | C. A. Harrell (M) 2 | 1932 |
| Elmira (1) | 47,397 | C | 1934 | Florence J. Sullivan (Assoc. M) | 1934 |
| Mamaroneck (2) | 11,766 | C | 1931 | R. J. Whitney (M) 2 | 1931 |
| Newburgh (7) | 31,275 | C | 1916 | Joseph A. Fogarty | 1934 |
| New Rochelle (2) | 54,000 | C | 1932 | I. C. Brower (M) 4 | 1934 |
| Niagara Falls (3) | 75,460 | C | 1916 | William D. Robbins (M) | 1924 |
| Rochester (4) | 328,132 | C | 1928 | Harold W. Baker (Assoc. M) | 1934 |
| Saranac Lake (1) | 8,020 | C | 1929 | Wayne E. Timmerman (M) | 1929 |
| Schenectady | 95,692 | C | 1936 | | |
| Sherrill (6) | 2,150 | C | 1916 | V. L. Allen | 1934 |
| Watertown (3) | 32,205 | C | 1920 | Paul B. Sutton (M) | 1930 |
| Watervliet (4) | 16,083 | O | 1920 | Frank Mahar (Assoc. M) | 1932 |
| **NORTH CAROLINA** | | | | | |
| Asheville (2) | 50,193 | C | 1931 | George L. Hackney (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Chapel Hill (3) | 2,699 | C | 1922 | J. L. Caldwell (Assoc. M) | 1932 |
| Charlotte (2) | 82,675 | C | 1929 | J. B. Pridgen | 1931 |
| Durham (3) | 52,037 | C | 1917 | Robert W. Flack (M) 2 | 1929 |
| Durham County (1) | 67,190 | C | 1930 | D. W. Newsom (M) | 1930 |
| Elizabeth City (7) | 10,037 | C | 1915 | J. B. Flora | 1931 |
| Gastonia (3) | 17,093 | C | 1919 | H. Rutter | 1929 |
| Goldsboro (5) | 14,985 | C | 1917 | Zeno G. Hollowell (M) | 1926 |
| Greensboro (2) | 53,569 | C | 1921 | Andrew Joyner, Jr. (Assoc. M) | 1932 |
| Hickory (7) | 7,363 | C | 1913 | R. L. Hefner (M) | 1932 |
| High Point (5) | 36,745 | C | 1915 | E. M. Knox (M) 2 | 1928 |
| Monroe (1) | 6,100 | O | 1932 | H. L. Burdette (Assoc. M) | 1932 |
| Morganton (10) | 6,001 | C | 1913 | W. I. Davis | 1929 |
| Reidsville (3) | 6,851 | C | 1921 | J. L. Womack | 1926 |

## NORTH CAROLINA (Continued)

| City | Population 1930 | Plan | In Effect | Name of Manager | Year Appointed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rocky Mount (2) | 21,412 | C | 1927 | L. B. Aycock (M) | 1929 |
| Roxboro (3) | 3,657 | O | 1928 | R. A. Burch | 1934 |
| Salisbury (3) | 16,951 | C | 1927 | H. C. Holmes | 1933 |
| Thomasville (7) | 10,090 | C | 1915 | R. M. Cooksey | 1923 |
| Wilson (1) | 12,613 | C | 1933 | W. M. Wiggins | 1933 |

## NORTH DAKOTA

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Minot (1) | 16,099 | C | 1933 | J. W. Bliss (Assoc. M) | 1933 |

## OHIO

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ashtabula (6) | 23,301 | C | 1916 | Carey S. Sheldon (Assoc. M) | 1934 |
| Bedford (1) | 6,814 | C | 1932 | Arthur H. Wedge (M) | 1932 |
| Celina (1) | 4,664 | O | 1926 | W. R. Cook | 1926 |
| Cincinnati (2) | 451,160 | C | 1926 | Clarence A. Dykstra (M) | 1930 |
| Cleveland Hts. (1) | 50,945 | C | 1922 | H. H. Canfield (M) | 1922 |
| Dayton (4) | 200,982 | C | 1914 | F. O. Eichelberger (M) | 1921 |
| East Cleveland (2) | 39,667 | C | 1918 | Charles A. Carran (M) | 1922 |
| Gallipolis (7) | 7,106 | C | 1918 | A. R. Henke | 1934 |
| Hamilton (1) | 52,176 | C | 1928 | Russell P. Price (M) | 1928 |
| Ironton (2) | 16,621 | C | 1930 | Leonard G. Howell (M) | 1930 |
| Middletown (5) | 29,992 | O | 1921 | Walter J. Braun | 1934 |
| Oakwood (1) | 6,494 | C | 1932 | Lawrence M. Dissinger (M) | 1932 |
| Oberlin (2) | 4,292 | C | 1926 | Leon A. Sears (M) 2 | 1928 |
| Painesville (3) | 10,944 | C | 1920 | George R. Moodey (M) | 1930 |
| Piqua (1) | 16,009 | C | 1930 | L. G. Whitney (M) 2 | 1930 |
| Portsmouth (2) | 42,560 | C | 1930 | Frank E. Sheehan (Assoc. M) | 1932 |
| Sandusky (5) | 24,622 | C | 1916 | Robert L. J. Wagar (Assoc. M) | 1934 |
| South Charleston (3) | 1,208 | C | 1918 | Charles D. Sprague | 1926 |
| Springfield (8) | 68,743 | C | 1914 | Pearl A. Lewis | 1934 |
| Toledo | 290,718 | C | 1936 | | |
| Washington Court House | 8,426 | C | 1936 | | |
| Westerville (5) | 2,879 | C | 1916 | Ross E. Windom (M) | 1930 |
| Xenia (3) | 10,507 | C | 1918 | M. C. Smith | 1930 |

## OKLAHOMA

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ardmore (4) | 15,741 | C | 1921 | Charles F. Adams | 1931 |
| Bartlesville (1) | 14,763 | O | 1927 | Ross Taylor (M) 2 | 1927 |
| Chandler (3) | 2,717 | C | 1925 | L. C. Green | 1928 |
| Cleveland (2) | 2,959 | C | 1931 | George H. Greiner | 1932 |
| Coalgate (7) | 2,064 | C | 1914 | R. M. Lacy | 1925 |
| Cushing (1) | 9,301 | C | 1929 | James W. Flint (M) 2 | 1929 |
| Devol (3) | 328 | C | 1920 | J. C. Dulaney | 1924 |
| Duncan (7) | 8,363 | C | 1920 | J. B. McLendon | 1932 |
| Edmond (2) | 3,576 | C | 1925 | Fred M. Stephenson | 1931 |
| Elk City (6) | 5,666 | C | 1929 | F. C. Gowdy | 1933 |
| El Reno (3) | 9,384 | C | 1926 | C. C. Holden (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Grandfield (3) | 1,416 | C | 1921 | Frank H. Lawrence | 1929 |
| Guthrie (2) | 9,582 | C | 1929 | John T. Hamill 2 | 1935 |
| Heavener (3) | 2,269 | C | 1922 | G. D. Hughes | 1929 |
| Madill (5) | 2,203 | C | 1917 | Homer Moss | 1925 |
| Mangum (8) | 4,806 | C | 1914 | H. T. Lawrence (M) | 1929 |
| McAlester (6) | 11,804 | C | 1919 | Verlin Thompson | 1932 |
| Muskogee (6) | 32,026 | C | 1920 | T. P. Clonts | 1932 |
| Norman (5) | 9,603 | C | 1919 | R. E. Clement (M) | 1931 |
| Nowata (5) | 3,531 | C | 1920 | Ed Chouteau, Jr | 1928 |
| Oklahoma City (5) | 185,389 | C | 1927 | O. M. Mosier (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Pawhuska (6) | 5,931 | C | 1921 | J. M. Buckley (Assoc. M) | 1931 |
| Sallisaw (1) | 1,785 | C | 1919 | Fred E. Johnston (M) | 1919 |
| Sapulpa (4) | 10,533 | C | 1922 | Fred M. Boone | 1932 |
| Shawnee (1) | 23,283 | C | 1930 | T. E. Thompson (M) 2 | 1930 |
| Tecumseh (3) | 2,419 | C | 1929 | Clyde McMahan (Assoc. M) | 1933 |

OKLAHOMA (Continued)

| City | Population 1930 | Plan | In Effect | Name of Manager | Year Appointed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Walters (5) | 2,252 | C | 1919 | Andy Carver (Assoc. M) | 1931 |
| Woodward (3) | 5,056 | C | 1929 | C. C. Miller | 1934 |
| Yale (7) | 1,734 | C | 1921 | J. H. Bennington | 1933 |
| OREGON | | | | | |
| Astoria (3) | 10,349 | C | 1923 | James O. Convill (Assoc. M) | 1934 |
| Bend (1) | 8,848 | C | 1929 | C. G. Reiter (M) 2 | 1929 |
| Hillsboro (2) | 3,039 | C | 1924 | George McGee (Assoc. M) | 1929 |
| La Grande (9) | 8,050 | C | 1913 | Angus McAllister (M) | 1931 |
| Oregon City (1) | 5,761 | C | 1924 | J. L. Franzen (M) | 1925 |
| Warrenton (7) | 683 | C | 1923 | George Kelly | 1933 |
| PENNSYLVANIA | | | | | |
| Ambridge (3) | 20,227 | O | 1918 | (Vacancy) | |
| Aspinwall (1) | 4,263 | O | 1925 | Harry C. Lea | 1925 |
| Avalon (1) | 5,940 | O | 1927 | Joseph N. Arthur (M) | 1928 |
| Blairsville (2) | 5,296 | O | 1922 | H. C. McCrea (Assoc. M) | 1934 |
| Carlisle (2) | 12,596 | O | 1921 | George P. Searight (M) | 1927 |
| Edgewood (1) | 4,821 | O | 1931 | E. O. Garrett (M) 2 | 1931 |
| Edgeworth (4) | 1,679 | O | 1914 | H. F. Burkholder (M) | 1923 |
| Ellwood City (1) | 12,323 | O | 1928 | Lowell W. Monroe (M) | 1928 |
| Hanover (1) | 11,805 | O | 1928 | C. A. Eckbert 2 | 1928 |
| Lansdowne (1) | 9,542 | O | 1922 | Frank B. Titus | 1922 |
| Milton (2) | 8,552 | O | 1925 | C. C. Congdon (M) | 1928 |
| Mt. Lebanon (3) | 13,403 | O | 1928 | F. W. Cooke (Assoc. M) | 1931 |
| Northampton (1) | 9,730 | O | 1932 | Hale A. Guss (M) 2 | 1932 |
| Osborne (2) | 506 | O | 1921 | H. F. Burkholder (M) | 1923 |
| Phoenixville (1) | 12,029 | O | 1930 | Norman G. Young (M) 2 | 1930 |
| Sewickley (2) | 5,599 | O | 1918 | John C. Hiteshew (M) | 1921 |
| Towanda (1) | 4,104 | O | 1918 | William T. Howie | 1918 |
| Waynesboro (1) | 10,167 | O | 1922 | A. Stover Fitz | 1922 |
| West Reading (2) | 4,908 | O | 1926 | D. C. Wagner (M) | 1927 |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | | | | | |
| Beaufort (7) | 2,776 | C | 1915 | Charles Knott (Assoc. M) | 1928 |
| Florence (4) | 14,774 | C | 1921 | D. G. Adams | 1933 |
| Rock Hill (4) | 11,322 | C | 1915 | T. C. Marshall (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Sumter (10) | 11,780 | C | 1912 | J. A. Raffield (Assoc. M) | 1934 |
| SOUTH DAKOTA | | | | | |
| Clark (2) | 1,290 | O | 1912 | Elmer Kirkeby | 1924 |
| Rapid City (4) | 10,404 | C | 1921 | E. M. Sneckenberger (M) | 1931 |
| TENNESSEE | | | | | |
| Alcoa (1) | 5,255 | C | 1919 | V. J. Hultquist (M) | 1919 |
| Elizabethton (4) | 8,093 | C | 1921 | E. C. Alexander | 1934 |
| Kingsport (3) | 11,914 | C | 1917 | F. L. Cloud (M) | 1923 |
| Knoxville (6) | 105,802 | C | 1923 | W. W. Mynatt (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Murfreesboro (2) | 7,993 | C | 1920 | S. S. Cox (M) | 1927 |
| TEXAS | | | | | |
| Amarillo (9) | 43,132 | C | 1913 | H. R. Smith (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Austin (2) | 53,120 | C | 1926 | Guiton Morgan (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Beaumont (6) | 57,732 | C | 1919 | G. H. Petkovsek | 1934 |
| Belton (1) | 3,779 | C | 1931 | A. E. Taylor | 1931 |
| Big Spring (3) | 13,735 | C | 1926 | E. V. Spence (M) 2 | 1931 |
| Borger (2) | 6,532 | C | 1930 | Charles Chapman | 1933 |
| Brenham (2) | 5,974 | C | 1923 | T. A. Low | 1930 |
| Brownsville (5) | 22,021 | C | 1915 | Z. A. Rosenthal (M) | 1930 |
| Brownwood (11) | 12,789 | C | 1916 | W. H. Thompson | 1934 |
| Bryan (5) | 7,814 | C | 1917 | Richard G. Williams (M) | 1930 |
| Burkburnett (4) | 3,281 | C | 1923 | R. P. Reagan (2) | 1929 |

TEXAS (Continued)

| City | Population 1930 | Plan | In Effect | Name of Manager | Year Appointed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dallas (1) | 260,475 | C | 1931 | John N. Edy (M) 3 | 1931 |
| Eastland (5) | 4,648 | C | 1919 | Walter Gray | 1934 |
| Fort Worth (2) | 163,447 | C | 1925 | Geo. D. Fairtrace (M) 3 | 1931 |
| Gainesville (1) | 8,915 | C | 1927 | Louis House | 1928 |
| Goose Creek (5) | 5,208 | C | 1928 | Henry Whiddon (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Jacksonville (1) | 6,748 | C | 1931 | J. Bryan Miller (M) 5 | 1931 |
| Kerrville (3) | 4,546 | O | 1927 | A. P. Hancock (Assoc. M) 2 | 1933 |
| Longview (2) | 5,036 | C | 1923 | Bill N. Taylor (M) | 1928 |
| Lubbock (4) | 20,520 | C | 1917 | W. H. Rodgers (Assoc. M) | 1931 |
| Lufkin (6) | 7,311 | C | 1919 | T. L. Dunn | 1931 |
| Marshall (1) | 16,203 | C | 1927 | H. J. Graeser (M) 3 | 1927 |
| Mexia (4) | 6,579 | C | 1920 | Howard F. Mace (M) | 1931 |
| Pampa (2) | 10,470 | C | 1927 | C. L. Stine (Assoc. M) | 1932 |
| Panhandle (3) | 2,035 | O | 1923 | J. G. Wadsworth | 1930 |
| Port Arthur (1) | 50,902 | C | 1932 | R. L. Cooper (M) 2 | 1932 |
| San Angelo (6) | 25,308 | C | 1916 | E. E. Lowrie (M) | 1930 |
| Sherman (2) | 15,713 | C | 1915 | W. Morgan Works (Assoc. M) | 1932 |
| Stamford (5) | 4,095 | C | 1918 | R. G. Bowdry (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Sweetwater (1) | 10,848 | C | 1928 | S. H. Bothwell (M) 2 | 1928 |
| Taylor (4) | 7,463 | C | 1914 | O. W. Davis | 1933 |
| Teague (3) | 3,509 | O | 1915 | F. F. Sims | 1929 |
| Temple (5) | 15,345 | C | 1922 | N. A. Ensor (Assoc. M) | 1934 |
| Terrell (4) | 8,795 | C | 1919 | L. A. Markham | 1924 |
| Tyler (5) | 17,113 | C | 1915 | A. H. Balch | 1935 |
| Waco (5) | 52,848 | C | 1924 | W. C. Torrence | 1934 |
| Wichita Falls (3) | 43,690 | C | 1928 | A. H. Douglass (Assoc. M) | 1934 |
| Yoakum (4) | 5,656 | C | 1915 | C. C. Crutchfield (M) | 1932 |
| VERMONT | | | | | |
| Bellows Falls (2) | 3,930 | C | 1927 | Morton F. Downing | 1931 |
| St. Johnsbury (3) | 7,920 | C | 1923 | C. S. Sumner 2 | 1934 |
| Springfield (2) | 4,943 | C | 1920 | Roy M. Wilcomb | 1923 |
| Windsor (Town) (1) | 3,689 | C | 1931 | George Austin | 1931 |
| VIRGINIA | | | | | |
| Albemarle County (1) | 26,981 | C | 1933 | H. A. Haden | 1933 |
| Alexandria (4) | 24,149 | C | 1922 | E. C. Dunn | 1935 |
| Appalachia (2) | 3,595 | C | 1931 | J. H. Fletcher | 1931 |
| Arlington County (1) | 26,615 | C | 1932 | Roy S. Braden (M) 2 | 1932 |
| Bedford (3) | 3,713 | O | 1920 | W. C. Ballard | 1930 |
| Blackstone (3) | 1,772 | O | 1914 | C. H. Hardy | 1925 |
| Bluefield (2) | 3,906 | C | 1930 | Robert E. Baylor | 1934 |
| Bristol (7) | 8,840 | C | 1919 | James F. McCrary (M) | 1928 |
| Charlottesville (7) | 15,245 | C | 1913 | Seth Burnley (Assoc. M) | 1932 |
| Covington (2) | 6,538 | C | 1925 | J. S. Mathers | 1931 |
| Crewe (1) | 2,152 | C | 1926 | William P. Taylor | 1926 |
| Culpeper (2) | 2,379 | C | 1930 | V. Von Gemmingen (Assoc. M) | 1931 |
| Farmville (5) | 3,133 | C | 1915 | R. W. Catlin (M) 2 | 1930 |
| Franklin (3) | 2,930 | C | 1922 | J. W. B. Thompson (M) | 1927 |
| Fredericksburg (2) | 6,819 | O | 1912 | L. J. Houston, Jr. (M) | 1918 |
| Front Royal (1) | 2,424 | C | 1930 | L. B. Dutrow (M) | 1930 |
| Galax (2) | 2,544 | O | 1922 | H. M. Todd (Assoc. M) | 1928 |
| Hampton (2) | 6,382 | C | 1920 | J. B. Sinclair, Jr. | 1923 |
| Henrico County (1) | 30,310 | C | 1934 | Willard F. Day (M) 2 | 1934 |
| Hopewell (3) | 11,327 | C | 1924 | W. Guy Ancell (Assoc. M) 2 | 1934 |
| Lynchburg (2) | 40,661 | C | 1920 | R. W. B. Hart | 1926 |
| Manassas (2) | 1,215 | O | 1927 | W. F. Cocke (M) | 1928 |
| Newport News (3) | 34,417 | C | 1920 | J. C. Biggins (M) | 1925 |
| Norfolk (4) | 129,710 | C | 1918 | Thomas P. Thompson (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Petersburg (4) | 28,564 | C | 1920 | H. A. Yancey (M) 2 | 1932 |
| Portsmouth (6) | 45,704 | C | 1917 | E. B. Hawks (Assoc. M) | 1935 |

## VIRGINIA (Continued)

| City | Population 1930 | Plan | In Effect | Name of Manager | Year Appointed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Radford (5) | 6,227 | C | 1920 | E. L. Udell | 1932 |
| Roanoke (1) | 69,206 | C | 1918 | William P. Hunter (M) | 1918 |
| Salem (4) | 4,833 | C | 1922 | J. J. Cassady | 1935 |
| Staunton (4) | 11,990 | C | 1908 | J. C. Ruff (Assoc. M) | 1934 |
| Suffolk (1) | 10,271 | C | 1919 | R. H. Brinkley (M) | 1919 |
| Warrenton (3) | 1,450 | O | 1920 | Sidney Shumate | 1923 |
| Waynesboro (1) | 6,226 | C | 1928 | I. G. Vass (M) 2 | 1929 |
| Williamsburg (1) | 3,778 | C | 1932 | A. L. Meisel | 1932 |
| Winchester (4) | 10,855 | O | 1915 | A. M. Field (Assoc. M) | 1935 |
| Wytheville (2) | 3,327 | C | 1927 | R. W. Arthur (Assoc. M) 2 | 1929 |
| **WEST VIRGINIA** | | | | | |
| Bluefield (4) | 19,339 | C | 1921 | Kyle L. Bruce (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Clarksburg (7) | 28,866 | C | 1921 | James S. Rodney | 1933 |
| Follansbee (1) | 4,841 | C | 1927 | Delmar Jenkins | 1927 |
| Hinton (3) | 6,654 | C | 1927 | (Vacancy) | |
| Morgantown (5) | 16,186 | C | 1921 | Elmer W. Prince (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| St. Marys (2) | 2,182 | C | 1921 | J. Bernard Riggs | 1925 |
| **WISCONSIN** | | | | | |
| Beloit (4) | 23,611 | C | 1929 | George B. Ingersoll (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Fort Atkinson (1) | 5,793 | C | 1931 | A. J. Koenig (M) 2 | 1931 |
| Janesville (1) | 21,628 | C | 1923 | Henry Traxler (M) 2 | 1923 |
| Kenosha (3) | 50,262 | C | 1922 | H. C. Laughlin (Assoc. M) | 1933 |
| Rhinelander (3) | 8,019 | C | 1926 | Theo. M. Wardwell (M) | 1929 |
| Shorewood (2) | 13,479 | O | 1928 | H. A. Schmitt (M) | 1930 |
| Stevens Point (2) | 13,623 | C | 1928 | Peter Walraven (M) 2 | 1930 |
| Two Rivers (2) | 10,083 | C | 1925 | E. J. Donnelly (M) | 1928 |
| **CANADA** | | | | | |
| **ALBERTA** | | | | | |
| Lethbridge (1) | 13,489 | C | 1927 | J. T. Watson | 1928 |
| **NEW BRUNSWICK** | | | | | |
| Woodstock (5) | 3,259 | C | 1919 | A. Gordon Bailey | 1933 |
| **ONTARIO** | | | | | |
| Chatham (3) | 14,569 | C | 1922 | T. M. S. Kingston | 1935 |
| Niagara Falls (2) | 19,046 | O | 1923 | H. E. Goddard (Assoc. M) | 1928 |
| **QUEBEC** | | | | | |
| Arvida (2) | 1,835 | O | 1926 | D. J. Wyber (Assoc. M) | 1930 |
| Grande Mere (3) | 6,461 | C | 1920 | J. Henri Valiquette (Assoc. M) 3 | 1934 |
| La Tuque (5) | 7,871 | C | 1921 | Jean Asselin (Assoc. M) | 1934 |
| Montreal-East (1) | 2,242 | C | 1925 | J. N. Langelier 2 | 1925 |
| Mount Royal (1) | 3,153 | O | 1934 | T. S. Darling | 1934 |
| Outremont (2) | 27,850 | O | 1918 | R. E. Lacroix (M) | 1924 |
| St. Lambert (1) | 6,075 | C | 1924 | M. J. Rutledge 2 | 1927 |
| Shawinigan Falls (2) | 15,345 | C | 1921 | N. J. A. Vermette (M) | 1927 |
| Temiskaming (2) | 3,000 | C | 1918 | A. K. Grimmer | 1923 |
| Westmount (2) | 24,189 | C | 1913 | Percy E. Jarman (M) | 1930 |
| **IRELAND** | | | | | |
| Cork (1) | 78,490 | C | 1929 | Philip Monahan | 1929 |
| Dublin (1) | 400,000 | C | 1930 | Gerald J. Sherlock | 1930 |
| Dun Laoghaire (1) | 35,111 | C | 1930 | P. J. Hernon | 1930 |
| Limerick | 39,000 | C | 1934 | J. P. Geraghty, Acting | 1934 |
| **PUERTO RICO** | | | | | |
| San Juan (1) | 114,715 | C | 1931 | Jesus Benitez (Assoc. M) | 1931 |

# Directories of City Officials

THIS section contains a directory of seventeen municipal officials in all of the 960 cities of more than 10,000 population (Tables VIII-A, VIII-B, and VIII-C). The officials included in the directory are: mayor, city clerk, city attorney, chief finance officer, city treasurer, city assessor, purchasing agent, health officer, director of public welfare, director of public works, city engineer, police chief, fire chief, superintendent of schools, librarian, superintendent of water works, and director of parks and recreation. City managers appear in a separate directory, Table VII on page 232. Every effort has been made to secure the name of each of these officials for all cities, and it is believed that for the most part omissions are due to the fact that there is no official with that title in the particular city concerned. The tables also indicate whether the official is elected or appointed, by whom he is appointed, and the number of years of service in his present position.[1]

The mayor is elected in all cities while the librarian is elected in none. City clerks, assessors, treasurers, and chief finance officers are each elected rather than appointed in more than one-fourth of the cities reporting. Less than 5 per cent of all cities report the election rather than the appointment of the superintendent of schools, city engineer, health officer, police chief, and fire chief.

*Tenure.* The length of service for all officials ranges from a few days, in the case of those appointed or elected since the beginning of 1935, to 61 years. The record of 61 years in one position is held by a water works superintendent, but the best record for tenure as a group is held by the librarians with an average tenure of 11.6 years, the water works superintendents ranking second with an average of 10.6 years. Fire chiefs and school superintendents come next with 9.9 and 9.7 years respectively, and city clerks and assessors follow each with an average of 8.7 years. Mayors have the shortest tenure of office with an average of only 3.9 years which may possibly be related to the fact that this entire group is elected rather than appointed to office. More mayors and fewer assessors have held office less than one year than any other group.

*Turnover.* By comparing the names of officials in cities over 30,000 with those reported last year[2] it was possible to estimate the turnover for each group of officials in cities of over 30,000 and these data are summarized in Table 2. By far the lowest turnover is recorded for the librarians with only 6.6 per cent of this group being replaced with new appointees. The highest turnover appeared among directors of public works with 28.2 per cent, with police chiefs and mayors following close behind with 22.6 per cent and 20.6 per cent respectively. The turnover for all officials reported both years was 16 per cent.

---

[1] Data on average salaries of municipal officials in 1930 and 1934 were reported in THE MUNICIPAL YEAR BOOK, 1934 (pp. 137-139) for population groups. The 1934 YEAR BOOK also showed the average tenure of officials under the several forms of municipal government.

[2] THE MUNICIPAL YEAR BOOK, 1934, pp. 140-163.

### TABLE I

PER CENT ELECTED AND TENURE OF 17 OFFICIALS IN CITIES OVER 10,000

| City Official | Per cent Elected | No. Reporting Tenure of One Year or More | Average Years Tenure for Officials with One Year or More of Service [1] | No. Officials with Less than One Year Service |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mayor | 100 | 812 | 3.9 | 53 |
| City Clerk | 29 | 821 | 8.7 | 32 |
| City Attorney | 11 | 803 | 5.5 | 46 |
| Chief Finance Officer | 42 | 616 | 6.6 | 28 |
| City Treasurer | 47 | 775 | 6.8 | 34 |
| City Assessor | 34 | 392 | 8.7 | 8 |
| Purchasing Agent | 15 | 444 | 5.3 | 19 |
| Health Officer | 3 | 727 | 7.9 | 34 |
| Director of Public Welfare | 22 | 330 | 5.3 | 13 |
| Director of Parks & Recreation | 12 | 550 | 7.4 | 15 |
| Director of Public Works | 24 | 446 | 5.8 | 18 |
| City Engineer | 2 | 712 | 8.3 | 28 |
| Superintendent of Water Works | 5 | 571 | 10.6 | 15 |
| Chief of Police | 3 | 778 | 7.5 | 51 |
| Fire Chief | 1 | 773 | 9.9 | 31 |
| Superintendent of Schools | 3 | 715 | 9.7 | 10 |
| Librarian | 0 | 667 | 11.6 | 9 |

[1] Reporting officers were asked to indicate number of years of service in present position to the nearest year. Officials not included in the average may be assumed to have less than six months of service. The average tenure for city managers is 5.8 years which includes all cities regardless of size and all cities served. This figure therefore is not comparable with other figures in this table.

*Civic Awards.* In at least fifteen communities the awards given by local civic organizations for meritorious service were won by public officials. Three city managers to win such awards were: H. C. McClintock of Boulder, Colorado, for "distinguished service"; Paul Morton of Lexington, Kentucky, "in recognition of outstanding public service to the community during the past year"; and Hollis R. Thompson of Berkeley, California, as the "young man who gave most to the community" in 1934. The award given by a special committee of outstanding citizens of St. Louis went to Louis Nolte, city comptroller. Elbert E. Lochridge, chief engineer of the municipal water works in Springfield, Massachusetts, received the annual distinguished service award made by a local advertising club. The award for "outstanding civic work" made by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Marion, Ohio, went to F. R. Mann, president of the park board. Martin McGill, high school teacher in Lorain, Ohio, was recognized as the "citizen who has given the most service during the year" by the *Lorain Journal,* leading local newspaper. The Junior Chamber of Commerce annual award in Glendale, California, went to Bernard Brennan, city attorney. Stanley Peeler, chairman of the recreation commission in West Palm Beach, Florida, received the annual award of the local Civitan Club. William Nicholson, policeman in Port Chester, New York, was recognized by the local Lions Club as performing the "outstanding police act" in 1934. Captain Nightingale, of the St. Paul, Minnesota, police department, received the annual medal awarded by a local civic organization. The award made by Samuel Berlin of Poughkeepsie, New York, for the "outstanding feat of heroism" by a local fireman was won by Sigmund Wirkowski in 1934. The annual award of the *Register and Tribune,* Des Moines, Iowa, newspaper, was given to E. H. Mulock, state relief administrator. Clifford Wells, high school basketball coach, was recognized by the Kiwanis Club as the "outstanding citizen" of Logansport, Indiana, in 1934.

TABLE 2

TURNOVER OF CITY OFFICIALS IN CITIES OVER 30,000 IN 1934

| City Officials | No. Cities Reporting Name of Official in 1934 and 1935 | No. Replaced During Year | Per Cent Turnover |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mayor | 306 | 63 | 20.6 |
| City Manager[1] | 440 | 71 | 16.1 |
| City Clerk | 295 | 35 | 11.9 |
| City Attorney | 309 | 61 | 19.7 |
| City Treasurer | 280 | 37 | 13.2 |
| City Assessor | 150 | 18 | 12.0 |
| Purchasing Agent | 189 | 30 | 15.9 |
| Health Officer | 297 | 54 | 18.2 |
| Director of Public Welfare | 150 | 29 | 19.3 |
| Director of Public Works | 195 | 55 | 28.2 |
| City Engineer | 298 | 42 | 14.1 |
| Chief of Police | 310 | 70 | 22.6 |
| Fire Chief | 305 | 43 | 14.1 |
| Superintendent of Schools | 306 | 34 | 11.1 |
| Librarian | 305 | 20 | 6.6 |
| All officials | 4135 | 662 | 16.0 |

[1] Turnover data for city managers includes the managers of all cities irrespective of size.

### ANALYSIS OF POSITIONS IN CITIES OVER 10,000

In considering the appointing authority, (city manager, mayor, council, board) for the chief officials discussed below the proportion of cities operating under each of the several forms of government should be kept in mind.

*Mayor.* The mayor is always an elected official. In most council-manager cities he is not elected as mayor but is selected by the council from its own membership. His title may be president or chairman of the council, and in commission cities he is generally also commissioner of finance or commissioner of fire and police. Mayor Harry Wooding of Danville, Virginia, with 44 years as mayor in that city, holds the record for tenure.

*City Manager.* The city manager is always appointed by the council and there are few variations in title. The city manager with the longest record in any one city is T. W. McMillan, Mt. Pleasant, Iowa, with 19 years. For other data on tenure of city managers see this YEAR BOOK, pages 229 to 232.

*City Clerk.* Of the 870 city clerks, 248 or 29 per cent are elected. Of the 622 who are appointed, 419 or 67 per cent are appointed by the council, 118 or 19 per cent by the mayor, 39 or 6 per cent by the manager, 15 or 3 per cent by a board, and the official who appoints 31 or 5 per cent is unknown. Peter B. Murphy of Marlborough, Massachusetts, with 52 years' service, holds the tenure record.

*City Attorney.* One hundred city attorneys in 888 cities or 11 per cent, are elected. Of the 788 who are appointed, 395 or 50 per cent are appointed by the council, 276 or 35 per cent by the mayor, 55 or 7 per cent by the city manager, 15 or 2 per cent by a board, and the official who appoints 47 or 6 per cent is unknown. A. A. Cochran of Chester, Pennsylvania, holds the tenure record with 40 years of service.

*Chief Finance Officer.* Of 658 chief finance officers, 278 or 42 per cent are elected. Of the 380 who are appointed, 186 or 48 per cent are appointed by the council, 107 or 30 per cent are appointed by the mayor, 49 or 13 per cent are appointed by the city manager, 7 or 2 per cent are appointed by a board, and the official who appoints 29 or 7 per cent is unknown. The titles reported include: director of finance, city auditor, city controller, and commissioner of finance. Robert M. Copeland of Revere, Massachusetts, with 36 years of service holds the record for tenure.

*City Treasurer.* Of 842 city treasurers, 397 or 47 per cent are elected. Of the 445 who are appointed, 237 or 53 per cent are appointed by the council, 98 or 22 per cent by the mayor, 57 or 13 per cent by the city manager, 13 or 3 per cent by a board, and the official who appoints 40 or 9 per cent is unknown. J. M. Pendleton of Westerly, Rhode Island, holds the record with 43 years of service.

*City Assessor.* The city assessor is elected in 185 or 34 per cent of 552 cities. Of the 367 who are appointed, 175 or 48 per cent are appointed by the council, 100 or 27 per cent by the mayor, 50 or 14 per cent by the city manager, 13 or 3 per cent by a board, and the official who appoints 29 or 8 per cent is unknown. Charles H. Callahan of Alexandria, Virginia, with 40 years of service holds the record. In many cities not reporting assessors this function is handled by the county.

*Purchasing Agent.* The purchasing agent is elected in 67 or 15 per cent of 441 cities. Of the 374 who are appointed, 183 or 49 per cent are appointed by the council, 95 or 26 per cent by the mayor, 53 or 14 per cent by the city manager, 13 or 3 per cent by a board, and the official who appoints 30 or 8 per cent is unknown. Jacob F. Ostrander of Roselle, New Jersey, holds the record with 27 years.

*Health Officer.* The health officer is elected in only 21 or 3 per cent of 837 cities. Of the 816 who are appointed, 236 or 29 per cent are appointed by the mayor, 201 or 25 per cent by the council, 189 or 23 per cent by the board of health, 106 or 13 per cent by the city manager, and the official who appoints 84 or 10 per cent is unknown. The record is held jointly by G. D. Lummis, of Middletown, Ohio, and Francis G. Curtis of Newton, Massachusetts, each with 45 years of service.

*Director of Public Welfare.* The director of public welfare is elected in 77 or 22 per cent of 344 cities. Of the 267 who are appointed, 87 or 33 per cent are appointed by the mayor, 62 or 23 per cent by the council, 48 or 18 per cent by a board, 42 or 16 per cent by the city manager, and the official who appoints 28 or 10 per cent is unknown. The record is held jointly by Joseph W. Proctor of Malden, Massachusetts, and Percy R. Horton of Portland, Maine, each with 25 years.

*Director of Parks and Recreation.* The director of parks and recreation is elected in 76 or 12 per cent of 630 cities. Of the 554 directors who are appointed, 173 or 31 per cent are appointed by a board, 124 or 22 per cent by the mayor, 108 or 20 per cent by the council, 87 or 16 per cent by the city manager, and the official who appoints 62 or 11 per cent is unknown. The record for tenure is held jointly by W. A. Howell of Raleigh, North Carolina, and John McLaren of San Francisco, California, each with 47 years of service.

*Director of Public Works.* The director of public works is elected in 118 or 24 per cent of 483 cities. Of the 365 who are appointed, 155 or 42 per cent are appointed by the mayor, 102 or 28 per cent by the council, 68 or 19 per cent by the city manager, 25 or 7 per cent by a board, and the official who appoints 15 or 4 per cent is unknown. The tenure record is held by C. H. Foster of Traverse City, Michigan, with 41 years of service.

*City Engineer.* The city engineer is elected in only 15 or 2 per cent of 787 cities. Of the 772 who are appointed, 292 or 38 per cent are appointed by the city council, 228 or 29 per cent by the mayor, 111 or 14 per cent by the city manager, 37 or 5 per cent by a board, and the official who appoints 104 or 14 per cent is unknown. The tenure record is held by Robert A. Cairns of Waterbury, Connecticut, with 44 years of service.

*Superintendent of Water Works.* The superintendent of water works is elected in only 30 or 5 per cent of 620 cities. Of the 590 who are appointed, 151 or 26 per cent are appointed by the city council, 139 or 23 per cent by a board, 119 or 20 per cent by the mayor, 94 or 16 per cent by the city manager, and the official who appoints 87 or 15 per cent is unknown. The tenure record is held by Fayette F. Forbes of Brookline, Massachusetts, with 61 years of service.

*Police Chief.* The chief of police is elected in only 24 or 3 per cent of 873 cities. Of the 849 chiefs who are appointed, 267 or 31 per cent are appointed by the mayor, 255 or 30 per cent by the city council, 134 or 16 per cent by the city manager, 78 or 9 per cent by a board, and the official who appoints 115 or 14 per cent is unknown. The tenure record is held by Michael J. Healy of Manchester, New Hampshire, with 43 years of service.

*Fire Chief.* Only 8 or 1 per cent of 861 fire chiefs are elected. Of the 853 chiefs who are appointed, 255 or 30 per cent are appointed by the city council, 245 or 29 per cent by the mayor, 136 or 16 per cent by the city manager, 69 or 8 per cent by a board, and the official who appoints 148 or 17 per cent is unknown. The tenure record is held jointly by Julius Jaeckel of Pekin, Illinois, and C. J. Murphy of Janesville, Wisconsin, each with 50 years of service.

*Superintendent of Schools.* The superintendent of schools is elected in only 21 or 3 per cent of 752 cities. Of the 731 superintendents who are appointed, 686 or 94 per cent are appointed by the school board, and a small scattering are appointed by either the mayor or the city council. The tenure record is held by John A. Gibson of Butler, Pennsylvania, with 39 years of service.

*Librarian.* 642 cities indicate that the librarian is appointed. Of these, 526 or 82 per cent are appointed by the library board, 26 or 4 per cent by the city council, 18 or 3 per cent by the city manager, 17 or 3 per cent by the mayor, and the official who appoints 55 or 8 per cent is unknown. The tenure record is held by Ellen Gale of Rock Island, Illinois, with 58 years of service.

# Table VIII-A

## DIRECTORY OF CITY OFFICIALS IN ALL CITIES OVER 10,000

Name, length of service, and method of selecting city officials as reported in February, 1935. Length of service in present position to nearest year is indicated by figure following the name; an (*) indicates less than one year's service. Letters after names: "E" indicates elected official; "A" appointed by city manager; "B" appointed by board other than council; "C" appointed by city council; "M" appointed by mayor; ‡ indicates appointed officials, but the appointing agency was not reported. Council-manager cities are indicated by a † sign after the name of the city. See Table VII, pages 232 to 240, for city manager directory. Every city over 10,000 is in this directory.

| City | Mayor (All elected) | City Clerk | City Attorney | City Engineer | Superintendent of Schools | City Librarian |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aberdeen, S. D. | I. N. Douglas 4 | Lydia W. Kohlhoff 15 B | Hugh Agor 5 B | | C. J. Dalthorpe 6 B | Dorothea Heins 15 B |
| Aberdeen, Wash. | H. Horrocks 1 | | L. T. Parker 1 M | S. C. Watkins 3 M | C. J. Powell | Florence K. Lewis 7 M |
| Abilene, Tex. | C. L. Johnson 2 | Agnes Allen 1 M | Wiley L. Coffey 2 M | O. K. Hobbs 6 M | R. D. Green 16 B | Mrs. Maude Cole 5 M |
| Ada, Okla. | J. D. Willoughby 2 | Albert Chamberlain 2 E | Hugh F. Mathis C | George Toler 1 C | B. R. Stubbs 4 B | |
| Adams, Mass. | Leander Parrott | Harriet L. Mooney E | Walter J. Donovan C | | Henry L. Cecil B | Irene Poiner B |
| Adrian, Mich. | Karl B. Hoch 1 | G. Percy Love 18 E | John C. Howell 4 C | Walter Frazier 6 C | Ernest J. Reed 4 B | Agnes Jewell 40 B |
| Akron, Ohio | I. S. Myers 1 | Josephine Bauman 14 C | C. C. Benner 1 M | E. A. Kemmler | R. H. Waterhouse 2 B | Will H. Collins 5 B |
| Alameda, Calif.† | W. F. Murray 4 | D. E. Dyer 2 C | H. L. George 2 C | George Sperbeck 2 A | William Paden 7 B | Jane Curtis 5 B |
| Albany, Ga.† | W. J. Collins* | Mrs. S. T. Dillingham 4 C | S. B. Lippitt 5 C | C. Q. Wright 10 C | R. E. Brooks 20 B | Mrs. E. W. Menko 30‡ |
| Albany, N. Y. | John Boyd Thacher 9 | Frank W. Hogan 5 C | George J. Reilly 6 M | John J. McManus 1 M | Austin R. Coulson 2 B | Elizabeth Smith 15 B |
| Albert Lea, Minn.† | E. L. Hayek 2 | A. E. Carlsen 5 A | William P. Sturtz 5 A | C. V. Jones 1 A | H. R. Peterson 2 B | Elizabeth Dorcas 3 A |
| Albuquerque, N. Mex.† | Charles H. Lembke* | Ida V. Malone 13 A | Fred E. Wilson 4 A | E. O. Betts 1 A | John E. Milne B | Mrs. N. F. Dixon 18 A |
| Alexandria, La. | V. V. Lamkin 8 | J. H. Brewer 8 C | S. L. Richey 8 M | I. W. Sylvester 12 C | H. M. Wells | Lillie Thornton 12 M |
| Alexandria, Va.† | Emmett C. Davison 1 | W. R. P. Taylor 13 C | Carl Budwesky 5 C | Emmett C. Dunn 40 C | T. C. Williams 2 B | Alice J. Green |
| Alhambra, Calif.† | Val Woodbury 2 | R. B. Wallace 2 E | J. B. Ogg 2 E | C. W. Paige‡ | George Bettinger‡ | Marian P. Green‡ |
| Aliquippa, Pa. | M. H. Sohn 6 | J. W. McElheny 8 C | W. D. Craig 12 C | H. M. Wright 10 C | H. R. Vanderslice 10 B | Susan Himmelwright 15 |
| Allentown, Pa. | Fred E. Lewis 3 | George W. Kistler* C | Robert L. Stuart 12 C | Earle W. Meckley 10 C | Hiram W. Dodd 15 B | Isabel M. Turner 20 |
| Alliance, Ohio | Guy Allott 1 | Harry D. Wilcoxon 1 C | Elsie Whittingham 1 E | W. D. Sponseller 1 M | B. F. Stanton 15 B | H. B. Sohn 8 B |
| Alpena, Mich.† | John D. Bingham 5 | Geo. R. Nicholson 14 M | A. W. Wilcox 1 M | A. M. Hopperstead 1 M | George H. Curtis 15 B | Helen Hempstead 3 B |
| Alton, Ill. | Thomas Butler 6 | O. Hemphill 8 E | Virgil Jacoby 2 M | C. F. Abraham 4 M | W. R. Curtis 15 B | Jane W. Bassett 10 |
| Altoona, Pa. | John J. McMurray 7 | William H. Baird 6 C | W. B. Manley 9 C | H. J. Baum 13 C | R. E. Laramy 14 B | Eleanor Krick 7 C |
| Amarillo, Tex.† | Ross D. Rogers 3 | LeVerne Calhoun 5 A | R. C. Johnson 8 A | H. R. Smith 3 A | W. A. McIntosh 10 B | Ruth Delzell C |
| Ambridge, Pa.† | P. J. Caul 5 | S. L. Card 7‡ | Eugene Caputo 1‡ | John Tew | Joseph Miller‡ | Sarah Caldwell‡ |
| Ames, Iowa† | W. L. Allan 1 | J. W. Prather 1 C | R. E. Nichol 5 C | J. H. Ames 8 C | M. G. Davis 8 B | Letha Davidson 7 B |
| Amesbury, Mass. | | Albert M. Grant E | Albert M. Miller 3 C | | Fred C. English 1 B | Marguerite Merrill B |
| Amsterdam, N. Y. | Arthur J. Carter 1 | John McClumpha E | Ralph Kurlbaum 1 E | Frank Huntington 1 E | Wilbur Lynch B | C. K. Lyons B |
| Anaconda, Mont. | Frank Provost 2 | Thomas Ferguson 2 M | D. H. Morgan 2 M | A. G. Davidson M | Helen MacMillan 2 E | Florence Catlin 15 B |
| Anaheim, Calif. | Charles H. Mann 3 | Charles E. Griffith 1 E | George F. Holden 7 M | E. P. Hapgood 9 M | Melbourne A. Gauer B | Elizabeth Calnon 10 B |

## Table VIII-A.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Mayor (All elected) | City Clerk | City Attorney | City Engineer | Superintendent of Schools | City Librarian |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anderson, Ind. | Harry R. Baldwin 2 | Richard Kettron* E | Harry Neff 5 M | Herbert Gwinnup 5 M | Arthur Campbell 2 B | Margaret A. Wade 16 |
| Anderson, S. C. | Graeme T. McGregor 5 | E. V. Shealy 3 C | G. Cullen Sullivan 29 C | F. R. Sweeney | E. C. McCants B | Olivia Duckett B |
| Annapolis, Md. | Walter E. Quenstedt 6 | Katherine Linthicum 6 C | Wm. J. McWilliams* C | | George S. Fox 12‡ | Liza Suydam 10 B |
| Ann Arbor, Mich. | Robert A. Campbell 2 | Fred C. Perry 6 E | William M. Laird 4 M | G. H. Sandenburgh 18 B | Otto W. Haisley 11 | Frances A. Hannum 7 |
| Anniston, Ala. | W. S. Coleman 2 | W. T. Morton, Jr. 10 E | J. F. Matthews 10 E | H. P. Harris 12 C | S. E. Alverson 6 B | Mildred Goodrich 8 B |
| Ansonia, Conn. | Peter Hart 2 | Paul E. Schumacher 2 E | Albert B. Gardella 2‡ | Vincent B. Clarke 2‡ | J. J. Stevens 1‡ | Anne G. Richards 1‡ |
| Appleton, Wis. | John Goodland, Jr. 5 | Carl J. Becher 7 E | Alfred C. Bosser 11 E | L. M. Schindler 8 E | Ben. J. Rohan 10 B | Mrs. N. B. Thomas B |
| Ardmore, Okla.† | W. H. Batis 2 | L. M. Thurston 16 A | J. E. Williams 5 A | Sam P. Matthews 12 A | J. J. Godbey 10 B | Myrtle Jones 29 B |
| Arkansas City, Kans.† | Gertrude T. Newman 2 | James F. Clough 2 A | Tom Pringle 4 A | D. A. Lawhe 15 A | C. E. St. John 17 B | Gertrude Hull 2 B |
| Arlington, Mass. | Leonard Collins 3 | E. Caroline Pierce 12 E | John L. Murphy 2 C | James M. Keane 7 C | C. H. Dempsey 3 B | Lucinda F. Spofford 7 B |
| Arnold, Pa. | M. F. Horne 4 | C. A. Steffey 2 C | Joe Bonidy 2 C | P. J. Malick 2 C | D. P. Davis 4 E | |
| Asbury Park, N. J.† | Sherman O. Dennis 1 | Roland H. Loog 1 C | Donald M. Waesche C | | Amos Kraybill 18 B | Josephine W. Porter 21 B |
| Asheville, N. C.† | Wickes Wamboldt 2 | E. G. Thompson 20 C | C. E. Blackstock 2 C | R. L. Maynard 4 A | R. H. Latham 2 B | Ann Erwin 30 B |
| Ashland, Ky.† | Edgar B. Hager 3 | George G. Hatcher 3 E | L. C. Fielder 3 A | C. D. O'Neill 3 E | W. L. Brooker 1 B | Sallie Martin |
| Ashland, Ohio | W. Art Mason 2 | Lotta Westover 2 E | C. S. Huffman 2 E | E. M. Kerr 2 M | E. L. Bowsher B | Lola Grabill B |
| Ashland, Wis. | J. M. Dodd 4 | W. C. Morris 24 M | John Garvin 6 M | James Phillips 14 M | I. O. Hubbard 16 B | Cecile M. Fennelly 2 |
| Ashtabula, Ohio† | W. O. Rainnie 2 | Jay H. Shaw 9 C | Tom R. Bailey 1 C | C. R. Stanhope 20 A | M. S. Mitchell 10 B | Ethel McDowell 15 B |
| Astoria, Ore.† | J. C. TenBrook 8 | | J. L. Hope 7 C | G. T. McClean 4 A | A. C. Hampton 10 | Katherine Barker B |
| Atchison, Kans.† | A. H. Lehman 2 | Nelle Blythe 10 A | Z. E. Jackson 5 A | E. E. Hellener 12 A | W. D. Wolfe 5 B | Elizabeth Hull 4 B |
| Athens, Ga. | A. G. Dudley 9 | James Barrow 16 M | L. C. Rucker 6 M | J. G. Beacham 5 M | B. M. Grier 5 B | Alice Walker |
| Athol, Mass. | Warren C. Karner | Walter E. Farnum 2 E | W. S. Duncan 10 C | James G. Cotton 14 E | Leon M. Farrin 5 B | Gladys C. Greene 7 B |
| Atlanta, Ga. | James L. Key 8 | J. Henson Tatum 4 C | James L. Mayson 33 E | Clarke Donaldson 6 | Willis A. Sutton 13 C | Jessie Hopkins 5 C |
| Atlantic City, N. J. | Harry Bacharach 5 | B. E. Whitman 7 M | A. J. Siracusa 2 M | Frank D. Mount 3 | Arthur S. Chenoweth B | Jessie F. Adams 15 B |
| Attleboro, Mass. | Frank R. Sweet* | Annie A. Wheeler 10 E | Henri G. Proulx 1 M | Robert W. Mawney | Lewis A. Fales B | Elizabeth L. Palmer 6 B |
| Auburn, Me.† | George C. Wing, Jr. 1 | G. W. Bumpus 34 C | D. Webber 3 C | F. W. Ford, Jr. 9 | G. W. Gardner 10 B | Georgiana Lunt 17 B |
| Auburn, N. Y.† | Kirk Bowen 3 | H. J. Lindsley 3 C | William S. Elder 19 A | Joseph J. Tehan 10 A | George F. Barford 12 B | Theodora Kellogg 10 B |
| Augusta, Ga. | Richard E. Allen, Jr.* | J. W. Westmoreland | William T. Gary | E. E. Pund | S. D. Copeland | Mrs. J. M. Johnston |
| Augusta, Me. | Frederick G. Payne* | S. Sewall Webster 6 M | Charles P. Nelson* M | Archie Norcross | Fred W. Burrill 10 B | Virginia Hill 1 |
| Aurora, Ill. | Conrad M. Bjorseth 4 | John P. Wetz 14 C | Merritt J. Little 4 C | Walter Deuchler 16 C | K. D. Waldo | Julia Fink 10 B |
| Austin, Minn. | H. J. Marcusen 3 | Fay R. Smith 17 M | B. E. Hughes 12 M | George L. Brown 10 M | S. T. Neveln 13 B | Tanye B. Hines B |
| Austin, Tex.† | Tom Miller 2 | Hallie McKeller 8 A | J. B. Rector 26 A | J. E. Motheral 2 A | A. N. McCallum 32 B | Darthula Wilcox 2 A |
| Bakersfield, Calif.† | J. R. Gist 2 | V. VanRiper 16 C | Walter Osborn 6 C | J. Holfelder 6 A | L. E. Chenoweth 7 B | John D. Henderson 2 |
| Baltimore, Md. | Howard W. Jackson 4 | | R. E. Lee Marshall 4 M | Bernard L. Crozier 4 M | David E. Weglein B | Horace E. Flack B |
| Bangor, Me.† | | Archie R. Lovette 3 C | William S. Cole 4 C | Phillip H. Glover 2 A | Irvin W. Small 9 B | Harvey R. Boyd 21 B |
| Barberton, Ohio | Earl L. Davis 1 | W. B. Young 1 C | Glen A. Peters 1 | H. W. Alcorn 35‡ | U. L. Light 10 B | Tallulah Kirk B |
| Barre, Vt. | John A. Gordon 1 | Ralph Olliver 9 E | C. O. Granai 1 M | Thurman W. Dix 10 M | R. E. Noble 1 B | Mildred I. Phelps |
| Bartlesville, Okla.† | H. G. Ellis 4 | Eva Sanderson 8 A | J. T. Shipman 8 C | J. E. McCormick 10 A | Charles Haskell 9 B | Ruth Brown 14 B |
| Batavia, N. Y. | James J. Mahaney* | Frank H. Webber 4 C | William H. Coon 6 E | Norman F. Hall 4 C | Clyde P. Wells 8 B | Julia May Booth 12 B |
| Baton Rouge, La. | W. H. Bynum 12 | | H. Payne Breazeale 14 M | R. Swart 4 C | W. B. Hatcher 19 | Mae Barrow |
| Battle Creek, Mich. | J. William Murphy 2 | Thomas J. Thorne 30 C | Walter H. North 3 C | Mark Chambers 2 C | William J. Colburn 30 B | Adah McCutcheon 10 B |
| Bay City, Mich.† | J. H. Nelson 10 | E. B. Bennett 1 C | A. W. Black 2 C | Ed. Wilhelm 6 C | G. L. Jenner 13 B | Isabel Ballou 15 B |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bayonne, N. J. | Lucius F. Donohoe 4 | William P. Lee C | James Benny C | Walter Clarkson C | Preston H. Smith 20 B | Mary G. Peters 28 B |
| Beacon, N. Y. | Irving J. Justus 1 | Thurlow Weed 1 E | Vincent D. Stearns 2 M | | Earl D. Hewes | Nancy M. Lamont 9 |
| Beatrice, Nebr. | J. B. High 3 | J. C. Douthitt 3 C | Harold Mattoon 1 C | William R. Ewing 3 C | E. L. Novotny 5 B | Madge Evans 3 B |
| Beaumont, Tex.† | P. D. Renfro 1 | Raymond Edmonds 10 C | M. L. Lefler 1 C | R. C. Black 10 A | M. E. Moore 15 B | Kathleen Munn 6 B |
| Beaver Falls, Pa. | Dennis Mutscheller 1 | Charles Ruhe 5 C | Leonard L. Ewing* C | Ivan P. Lindeman 5 C | Floyd Atwell | Elsie Rayle |
| Bedford, Ind. | Henry S. Murray 5 | Charles E. Johnson* E | A. J. Fields 5 M | Henry Pearson* M | W. J. Yount 2 B | Minta E. Stone |
| Bellaire, Ohio | W. T. Robertson 1 | | Esther F. Pinsky 3 E | James P. Dean 6‡ | J. V. Nelson 15 B | Ethel Houston |
| Belleville, Ill. | Geo. A. Brechnitz 4 | Arthur Vollrath 4 E | Louis J. Grossman 4 M | C. A. Heinzelman M | H. V. Calhoun | Bella Steuernagel B |
| Belleville, N. J. | William H. Williams 1 | Florence R. Morey 2 B | L. A. Keenan 3 B | Matthew Sheehan 3‡ | Wayne R. Farmer 4 B | Mrs. E. A. Shattack B |
| Bellevue, Pa. | William C. Means 1 | P. S. Strain 1 C | Geo. E. Morcroft, Jr. 3 C | McBride Eng. Co. C | H. E. Brumbaugh* B | Elizabeth Newell |
| Bellingham, Wash. | B. E. Hanning 1 | J. H. Stevenson 9 E | Hobert S. Dawson 1 E | Arthur A. Edson* M | C. Paine Shangle 2 B | Edith B. Carhart 10 B |
| Belmont, Mass. | J. Watson Flett | Arthur E. Hough 17 E | Amos L. Taylor 25 C | J. Leslie Woodfall 14 C | Frank A. Scott 14 B | Lucy D. Luard 18 B |
| Beloit, Wis.† | | Myrtle Sturtevant 6 A | C. L. Haugan 4 A | C. J. Popelka 4 A | D. F. R. Rice 2 B | Nell McAlpin 20 A |
| Benton Harbor, Mich.† | Mervyn G. Stouck* | Robert DeHaven* C | W. M. Cunningham 2 C | C. R. Wightman 2 A | S. C. Mitchell 8 B | T. Falkingham 10 B |
| Berkeley, Calif.† | Edward N. Ament 2 | Florence E. Turner 7 A | Fred C. Hutchinson 4 A | Harry Goodridge 5 A | Lewis Smith 7 B | Susan T. Smith 9 B |
| Berlin, N. H. | Daniel Feindel 1 | H. M. Moffett 15 C | M. J. Ryan 3 M | F. L. Brannen 17 M | L. P. Young 3 B | Agnes Sloane 9 B |
| Berwick, Pa. | Arthur E. Arndt 1 | D. William Arndt 3 C | George W. Moon 2 C | Boyd Trescott 14 C | M. E. Houck 10 B | Mrs. L. M. Bowman 10 B |
| Berwyn, Ill. | Maurice Shay 1 | Jerry Jacobsen 2 E | John O. Hruby 2 M | (Vacant) | Williams Hawkes | Margaret E. Ely 9 |
| Bessemer, Ala. | Jap Bryant | J. M. Scott‡ | G. W. Baine‡ | Arthur Houston‡ | J. E. Bryan B | Mrs. W. T. Warlick‡ |
| Bethlehem, Pa. | Robert Pfeifle 5 | Victor E. Tice 5 C | D. L. McCarthy 5 C | R. L. Fox 17 C | William H. Weiss 9 B | Harriet T. Root 12 B |
| Beverly, Mass. | James A. Torrey* | Edward P. Eldredge 16 C | Thomas S. Sullivan* M | A. H. Richardson 17 M | Starr King* B | Margorie Stanton 15 B |
| Beverly Hills, Calif. | Edward E. Spence 2 | B. J. Firminger 11 E | R. C. Waltz 11 C | W. R. Metz 10 C | Edward J. Hummel 10 | Mary Boynton 5 C |
| Biddeford, Me. | Arthur Remillard | Armand Duquette M | William P. Donahue M | | A. Alton Garcelon B | Emma Hatch‡ |
| Big Spring, Tex.† | C. E. Talbot | Herbert W. Whitney 2 A | Thomas J. Coffee 5‡ | E. V. Spence 3 C | W. C. Blankenship 7 B | Verbena Barnes |
| Billings, Mont. | C. J. Williams 1 | O. W. Nickey 8 M | George S. Smith 4 E | R. T. Hurdle 4 M | A. T. Peterson 5 B | Mrs. H. E. Garber 18 B |
| Biloxi, Miss. | John A. O'Keefe | F. A. Tucei E | (Law firm) | | George W. Ditto B | Miss Friedhoff B |
| Binghamton, N. Y.† | Miles M. Smith 3 | Robert Badger 3 C | Robert J. Ryan 1 A | John J. Giles 2 A | D. J. Kelly 23 B | Helen Stratton 7 B |
| Birmingham, Ala. | J. M. Jones, Jr. 9 | Eunice S. Hewes 9 C | W. J. Wynn 13 C | J. D. Webb 1 C | C. B. Glenn 14 B | Lila May Chapman 9 B |
| Bismarck, N. D. | A. P. Lenhart 14 | M. H. Atkinson 15 C | C. L. Foster 2 C | T. R. Atkinson 28 C | H. O. Sarvik 10 B | Ruth King 5 B |
| Bloomfield, N. J. | Harry E. Newell* | J. Cory Johnson 12 | Ed. C. Pettit 5 C | J. W. Obreiter 1 | Edgar Stover 6 B | Janet Melvain 9 B |
| Bloomington, Ill. | L. F. Wellmerling 2 | Herman J. Bock 11 E | Thomas Weldon E | Scott McCullough 8 E | S. K. McDowell 15 B | Nellie E. Parham 35 B |
| Bloomington, Ind. | A. H. Berndt | Vanna Thrasher E | Donald E. Bowen M | John T. Stapleton‡ | William F. Vogel B | Bertha Ashby |
| Bluefield, W. Va.† | W. A. Light 2 | Muriel B. Kerfoot 6 B | Sidney J. Kwass 2 B | | G. J. Wood | Mrs. F. L. Dow 1 |
| Blue Island, Ill. | Frank Kasten 6 | L. F. Schwartz 2 E | Roy Massena 14 M | Allen Fox 6 M | J. E. Lemon B | Louise Denton B |
| Blytheville, Ark. | Cecil Shane | G. R. Beavers E | Sam Manatt E | L. E. Tull | W. D. McClurkin 1 | Mrs. J. D. Swift |
| Bogalusa, La. | E. R. Cassidy 5 | K. I. Bean 19 M | G. V. Rich* E | H. E. Willis 17 C | J. N. Herrington* B | May Davis 4 B |
| Boise, Idaho | J. J. McCue | M. A. Regan‡ | Clarence Ward‡ | C. C. Stevenson‡ | W. D. Vincent | A. C. Gaylord, Jr. |
| Boone, Iowa | H. H. Canfield 4 | P. R. Pulver 1 C | F. L. Mackey 16 C | George A. Nelson 10 C | George S. Wooten 16 B | Bessie Moffatt 38 B |
| Boston, Mass. | F. W. Mansfield 1 | Wilfred J. Doyle 6 C | Henry E. Foley 1 M | | Patrick T. Campbell 3 B | Milton E. Lord 3 B |
| Boulder, Colo.† | H. H. Heuston 3 | Mayme Graham 14 A | Frank L. Moorhead 18 C | H. C. McClintock 4 | Virgil M. Rogers 1 | Iola Neil 3 B |
| Bowling Green, Ky. | B. S. Rutherford 2 | H. B. Webb* C | J. Frank Denton 2 C | E. P. Harris 2 M | T. C. Cherry 20 B | |
| Braddock, Pa. | James H. Rose 5 | Geo. B. McDonough 1 C | Leo Kostman 1 C | G. Milton Dillon | T. S. McCleary 12 B | Rev. Kline 3 B |
| Bradford, Pa. | T. P. Thompson 2 | M. E. Cornelius 10 C | F. M. Nash 12 C | J. H. Quirk 8 C | J. F. Butterworth 17 B | Grace Steele 14 B |
| Brainerd, Minn. | H. W. Creger 4 | Mrs. E. T. Fleener 13 C | D. H. Fullerton 15 E | R. T. Campbell 18 C | W. C Cobb 25 B | Zita Miller 4 B |
| Braintree, Mass. | Edward Avery 16 | Ernest C. Woodsum 5 E | A. G. Chapman 1 C | J. J. Drinkwater 3 C | C. E. Fisher 13 B | Alice A. Holbrook 23 B |
| Brawley, Calif. | S. D. Carey | O. May Juvenal 14 E | A. L. Sebille 7 C | O. F. Weissgerber* C | G. K. Anderson 2 B | Elinor Heimark 1 B |

## Table VIII-A.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Mayor (All elected) | City Clerk | City Attorney | City Engineer | Superintendent of Schools | City Librarian |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bremerton, Wash. | J. A. McGillivray 4 | E. J. McCall 20 C | H. E. Gorman 16 M | C. C. Casad 12 M | H. D. Sorensen 8 B | Evelyn M. Myers 3 B |
| Bridgeport, Conn. | Jasper McLevy 2 | Fred Schwarzkopf 2 E | Harry Schwartz 2 M | Frederick E. Toquet 6 M | Worcester Warren 6 B | Julian Sohon* B |
| Bridgeton, N. J. | L. W. Erickson 7 | Charles P. Corey 18 C | Samuel Iredell 6 M | Ed. H. Maier 2 C | Leigh Lott 2 B | Grace L. Todd 9 B |
| Bristol, Conn. | Joseph F. Dutton 9 | Rolfe E. Rowe 1 E | Francis V. Tracy 5 M | Carlton W. Buell 30 M | Karl A. Reiche 22 B | Charles L. Wooding 43 B |
| Bristol, Pa. | Clifford L. Anderson 14 | William J. Lefferts 6 C | Howard I. James 20 C | John S. Roberts, Jr. 20 C | Warren P. Snyder | Mary P. Rogers |
| Bristol, R. I. | Prescott Paul 2 | John W. Church 25 E | | | E. S. Mapes 10 B | Esther J. Osterberg |
| Bristol, Tenn. | Fred V. Vance 6 | W. K. Carson 14 C | J. K. Brown 9 C | Arthur Green 12 | R. B. Rubins 20 B | Lillian Fain 4 B |
| Brockton, Mass. | Horace C. Baker 3 | J. Albert Sullivan 4 | Lawrence Crowley 2 | Augustus Masefield | John F. Scully | Harland Carpenter 5 |
| Brookfield, Ill. | John Pinner 2 | Frank Fanning 2 E | Paul Pretzel 1 M | Walter Wilson 1 M | E. N. Cassidy 16 B | Ella Camp |
| Brookline, Mass. | Daniel A. Rollins 12 | F. B. Richardson 7 E | Philip S. Parker 9 C | Henry A. Varney 20 C | Ernest R. Caverly 3 B | Louisa M. Hooper 33 B |
| Brownsville, Tex.† | R. B. Rentfro 5 | Mrs. H. Van Horn 5 A | J. T. Canales 5 C | G. M. Hillyer 4 A | E. C. Dodd B | Anna Kelly |
| Brownwood, Tex.† | W. H. Thompson 1 | F. E. Scott 6‡ | R. L. McGaugh 1‡ | Mark E. Ragsdale | E. J. Woodward 10 E | Mrs. Ira Hall 3‡ |
| Brunswick, Ga.† | J. M. Gardner 3 | Hugh Burford 8 C | B. Nightengale 1 A | | R. D. Eadie 6 B | Mrs. J. C. Styles 4 B |
| Bucyrus, Ohio | George M. Birk 1 | H. A. Barth 4 C | John C. Carroll 1 E | F. L. Niederheiser 20‡ | E. N. Dietrich 7 B | Grace J. Fuller 17 B |
| Buffalo, N. Y. | Geo. J. Zimmermann 1 | John W. Wargin 3 C | Gregory V. Harmon* M | | Ernest C. Hartwell 18 B | Alexander Galt 2 B |
| Burbank, Calif.† | Frank C. Tillson 1 | R. H. Hill 4 C | Ralph Swagler 2 C | H. I. Stites‡ | Buel Enyeart B | Elizabeth Ripley |
| Burlingame, Calif. | Allan Hunt 2 | James R. Murphy 25 E | John F. Davis 6 C | Charles Thomas 5 C | Lester Henderson 6 B | Irene Smith 5 B |
| Burlington, Iowa | E. G. Marquardt 5 | Robert Schlampp 12 C | Fred S. Holsteen 5 C | H. A. Vollmer 16 C | W. G. Brooks 10 B | Mrs. C. P. Millard 15 B |
| Burlington, N. J. | Thomas J. Johnson 1 | Walter W. Marrs | Thomas D. Begley 2 | Samuel R. Probasco | Vann H. Smith | Lydia Weston |
| Burlington, Vt. | James E. Burke 5 | E. B. Corley 17 C | T. E. Hopkins 6 C | George C. Stanley 8 C | Lyman C. Hunt 8 B | George Dana Smith B |
| Butler, Pa. | George M. Thompson | | | Fred M. Harper | John A. Gibson 39 | Eleanor P. Beach 8 |
| Butte, Mont. | Archie McTaggart 4 | P. C. Dineen 4 M | Ed. M. Lamb 4 M | Mike Laughran 4 M | MayBelle Hogen 2 E | Elenore Horgon 2 M |
| Cairo, Ill. | August Bode 8 | Robert A. Hatcher 32 C | William S. Dewey 22 C | (Vacant) | Leo C. Schultz 2 | Effie A. Lansden B |
| Calumet City, Ill. | J. W. Jaranowski 10 | Frank W. Angel 4 E | F. M. Kenlay 4 C | George O. Consoer | J. A. Wieland | |
| Cambridge, Mass. | Richard M. Russell 5 | Fred H. Burke 14 M | E. L. Twomey 4 M | Frank Hooker 3 M | M. E. Fitzgerald 21 C | Thomas J. Sullivan 9 B |
| Cambridge, Ohio | E. B. Shipley 1 | Marjorie Bowers 3 C | Porter H. Forsythe 1 E | Arthur Beach 12‡ | Hugh R. Hick 6 B | Martha G. Robins |
| Camden, N. J. | Roy R. Stewart 4 | Frank S. Albright 3 M | E. G. Bleakly 4 C | Thomas J. Daley 10 C | L. N. Neulen 6 M | William H. Ketler 30 |
| Campbell, Ohio | T. Roy Gordon 1 | John M. Klimko 1 C | Anthony F. Pacella 1 E | Albert R. Haenny 20 C | Andrew S. Klinko 2 B | |
| Canonsburg, Pa. | Harry L. Cook | | | H. M. Day | F. W. McVay | Jennie E. McBurney |
| Canton, Ill. | J. Grant Davis | Joseph Waugh | | Howard Gibbons | R. W. Hyndman 12 | Dorothea Nelson 1 |
| Canton, Ohio | A. R. Turnbull 2 | Louis E. Deuble 2 C | W. Bernard Rodgers 2 | John A. Shisler M | Jesse H. Mason 4 B | Emma A. Geisler |
| Cape Girardeau, Mo. | Edward L. Drum 5 | W. C. Kaempfer 9 C | Frank Lowry 5 M | J. R. Walther 1 C | J. A. Whiteford 1 | Lenore Rafferty 10 B |
| Carbondale, Pa. | E. J. Healey 3 | J. A. Moffitt 3 C | J. E. Brennan 15 C | W. L. Giles 15 C | Mary B. McAndrew 2 B | Mrs. F. C. Leonard 2‡ |
| Carlisle, Pa.† | Raymond M. Heckman 1 | Mary Bitner 7 A | Guy H. Davies 3 C | George P. Searight 8 C | J. W. Potter 7 B | William H. Ames |
| Carnegie, Pa. | J. K. Nickel 8 | A. B. Lafferty 1‡ | James H. Duff 15‡ | W. W. Andrews 10‡ | N. L. Glasser 17‡ | Mary Harris 10 |
| Carteret, N. J. | Joseph W. Mittuch 1 | Harvey V. O. Platt 14 M | Abraham Glass 1 M | J. G. Jomo 1 M | B. V. Hermann 31 B | B. W. Harrington 1 B |
| Casper, Wyo. | J. F. Cowan 1 | W. W. Slack 7 M | E. E. Murane 1 M | F. S. Knittle 7 M | R. S. Hicks 9 | Eleanor Davis 7 |
| Cedar Rapids, Iowa | W. J. Neill 1 | L. J. Storey 27 C | Harry Johnson 1‡ | F. E. Young 7‡ | Arthur Deamer 13‡ | E. Johanna Hagey 21‡ |
| Central Falls, R. I. | John J. Healey 2 | Abel A. Guilmette 2 C | Z. J. Czubak 2 C | Abundius A. Brule 2 C | James E. Martin 2 B | Agnes M. Bacon 2 B |
| Centralia, Ill. | John McNeil 4 | James Maxfield 20 M | L. H. Jonas 4 M | H. B. Stover 1 M | R. V. Jordan 12 B | Godina Weldon 10 B |
| Chambersburg, Pa. | Robert C. Vanderau 3 | E. W. Davis 7 C | | F. D. Rhodes, Jr. C | U. L. Gordy B | Ruth Keefer |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Champaign, Ill. | Charles J. Mullikin 4 | B. J. Marshall 4 C | T. E. Lyons 4 C | F. C. Lohmann C | V. L. Nichell B | Ethel Kratz B |
| Chanute, Kans. | Watson Stewart 1 | Ross Cooper 3 C | John J. Jones 10‡ | F. W. Austin‡ | L. H. Petit 11 B | Pearl Hallenberg 3 B |
| Charleroi, Pa. | S. L. Woodward 4 | V. E. McVay 2 C | Roy I. Carson C | A. A. McDonald C | T. L. Pollock B | |
| Charleston, S. C. | Burnet R. Maybank 3 | Joseph C. Barbot 18 C | J. Waties Waring 3 C | J. H. Dingle 39 C | A. B. Rhett 23 | Parmelee Cheves 3 |
| Charleston, W. Va. | R. P. DeVan | S. C. Jarrett M | Charles Ritchie M | H. L. Campbell M | Elizabeth J. Goodall 5 | B. von Schlechtendal 12 |
| Charlotte, N. C.† | Arthur H. Wearn 2 | L. L. Ledbetter 2 C | E. B. Bridges 4 C | Wayte Thomas 7 C | H. P. Harding 22 B | Anne Pierce 17 B |
| Charlottesville, Va.† | W. D. Haden 1 | J. E. Bowen 1 C | E. V. Walker 5 C | S. L. Williamson 5 A | J. E. Johnson 15 B | Nancy W. Duke 3 B |
| Chattanooga, Tenn. | E. D. Bass 8 | F. K. Rosamond | J. W. Anderson 4 E | W. H. Wilson | William T. Robinson 8 | Nora Crimmins 11 |
| Chelsea, Mass. | Lawrence F. Quigley 10 | R. A. Voke 13 E | Max Wise 3 E | James A. O'Brien 25 M | George C. Francis 8 B | Esther C. Johnson 13 B |
| Chester, Pa. | William Ward, Jr. 8 | Benjamin Newsome 18 C | A. A. Cochran 40 C | F. Hartvigson 3 C | F. Herman Fritz 1 B | Gertrude Hewes 9 |
| Cheyenne, Wyo. | Archie Allison 1 | J. K. Stoddard 3 C | H. B. Henderson, Jr. 1 C | Z. E. Sevison * C | A. S. Jessup B | Frances Mentzer |
| Chicago, Ill. | E. J. Kelly 2 | Peter J. Brady 4 E | A. M. Smietanka 4 M | Loran D. Gayton 1 M | William J. Bogan 7 B | C. E. Roden 17‡ |
| Chicago Heights, Ill. | D. P. Bergin 8 | J. A. Klyczek 2 C | C. D. Gregory 4 C | E. H. Ashdown 12 C | Ben Sylla 1 B | May Donaldson 12 B |
| Chickasha, Okla. | C. A. Dearman 2 | R. E. DeKinder 2 E | C. A. Dearman 2 E | Paul Little 1‡ | T. T. Montgomery E | Ida May Sherman M |
| Chicopee, Mass. | Oneil Deroy | Charles LaRiviere E | Napoleon J. Vigeant M | Frank P. Cobb M | John J. Desmond, Jr. B | Anne Smith‡ |
| Chillicothe, Ohio | W. S. Barrett 1 | Louis A. Hibbler 7 | Phil Butler 3 E | Glenn Perry 1 M | W. L. Miller 5 B | Burton Stevenson 15 |
| Cicero, Ill. | Joseph G. Cerny 3 | Jerry J. Viterna 3 E | Edwin V. Turek 2 | Louis Mongreig 16 | George A. Schwebel 8 | William Teal 9 |
| Cincinnati, Ohio† | Russell Wilson 3 | L. B. Blakemore 9 C | John D. Ellis 9 A | H. H. Kranz 4 A | E. D. Roberts 5 B | Chalmers Hadley 10 B |
| Clairton, Pa. | R. W. Ostermayer 1 | P. G. Miller 13 C | C. A. Lewis 9 C | Frank L. Hill 1 C | H. D. Teal B | Anna O'Toole 14 B |
| Claremont, N. H. | | | | | Albert B. Kellogg 14 | Sarah G. Gilmore 6 |
| Clarksburg, W. Va.† | | William P. Coughlin 2 A | O. L. McDonald 2 A | T. S. Lang 17 A | W. H. Coffindaffer | Scolly Page 2 B |
| Clarksdale, Miss. | Ellington Fant 5 | R. E. Stratton, Jr. 19 | J. M. Talbot | W. S. Bobo 25 | H. B. Heidelberg | Miss H. L. Wilson |
| Cleburne, Tex. | J. S. Hoffman 3 | Miss Johnnie Gordon 6 M | Roy Anderson 2 E | W. B. Benton * M | Emmett Brown 22 C | Mrs. V. M. Fulton 12 |
| Cleveland, Ohio | Harry L. Davis 2 | Fred W. Thomas 13 C | Ezra Z. Shapiro 2 M | Robert Hoffman M | Charles Lake 2 B | Linda Eastman 17 B |
| Cleveland Hgts, Ohio† | Frank C. Cain 21 | H. M. Kimpel 3 C | Geo E. Hartshorn 15 C | F. A. Pease | F. L. Wiley B | Pauline Reich B |
| Cliffside Park, N. J. | Thomas G. Fox 1 | A. H. Abrams 13 M | Joseph W. Marini 6 M | S. Wood McClave 12 M | George F. Hall B | Maud Koch M |
| Clifton, N. J.† | Wilson S. Brower* | William A. Miller 15 M | John C. Barbour 5 C | John L. Fitzgerald 7 C | George J. Smith 20 | Marion Aron 7 B |
| Clinton, Iowa | William J. Greene | R. H. Gage | W. E. Purcell | Edward T. Carey | Clark W. Brown 11 | Lillian Sutherland 6 |
| Clinton, Mass. | Edward F. Kelley | | | | Thomas F. Gibbons 20 | Helen A. Thissell |
| Coatesville, Pa. | William G. Gordon 3 | Frank P. Pennegar 3 C | W. E. Greenwood 3 C | William C. Emigh 3 C | Carl O. Benner 9 | |
| Coffeyville, Kans. | J. D. Byers 2 | A. P. Irvin 8 M | A. A. Baker 2 M | E. L. Brown 8 M | A. I. Decker 15 B | Edith M. Norton 2 B |
| Cohoes, N. Y. | John J. Morrissey 1 | Wilfred Amyot 1 C | John A. Brady 1 M | John E. Byron 1 M | Wm. S. Schneider 3 B | Frank Tissier 6 B |
| Collingswood, N. J. | Joseph H. VanMeter 6 | R. S. Wigfield 1 C | William Harris 2 C | | John B. Ritter 11 B | Mrs. K. DeGinther 24 B |
| Colo. Springs, Colo.† | George G. Birdsall 6 | S. E. Nichols 12 C | Ben S. Wendelken 4 C | Frank O. Ray 13 A | H. M. Corning 7 B | Margaretta M. Boas 7 B |
| Columbia, Mo. | R. S. Pollard 2 | Bruce J. Carl 1 M | George A. Spencer 2 E | W. B. Cauthorn 1 M | W. E. Rosenstengel 2 B | Pearl Clarkson 1 B |
| Columbia, Pa. | Arthur E. Snavely | | | A. L. Purple | John B. Kennedy 5 | Edna L. Yergey |
| Columbia, S. C. | L. B. Owens 9 | B. E. Abrams 4 C | P. A. Cooper 4 C | W. S. Tomlinson 9 C | A. Cline Flora 7 | Lucy H. Bostick |
| Columbus, Ga.† | J. Homer Dimon 10 | Milton Long 13 C | W. deL. Worsley 6 C | H. W. Rattray 7 A | R. B. Daniel 20 B | Connie Gordy 10 B |
| Columbus, Miss. | T. W. Harris 2 | T. W. Lewis, Jr. 6 C | T. W. Lewis, Jr. 1 C | | C. N. Brandon 6 B | |
| Columbus, Ohio | Henry W. Worley 3 | Helen Howard* C | John L. Davies 6 E | Paul Maetzel* ‡ | J. G. Collicott 14 B | John J. Pugh 40 B |
| Compton, Calif.† | C. S. Smith 2 | Blanche C. Firkins 2 E | Ralph Pierson 2 E | Albert B. Gidley* C | Scott Thompson | Rena Hathorn |
| Concord, N. H. | John W. Storrs | Arthur E. Roby C | Robert J. Kelliher C | Fred W. Lang B | Charles W. Walker B | Grace Blanchard B |
| Concord, N. C. | W. A. Wilkinson 4 | B. E. Harris 10 C | Z. A. Morris, Jr. 6 C | Walter L. Furr 6 C | A. S. Webb 23 B | Mrs. R. Reed 15 B |
| Connellsville, Pa. | H. D. Minerd 2 | S. T. Benford 2 C | J. Kirk Renner 2 C | J. E. Hoenshel 2 C | B. B. Smith 1 B | Sally C. Seaton 2 B |
| Connersville, Ind. | William Dentlinger 4 | Frank C. Sherry 4 E | Leroy C. Hanley 4 M | Russell Crouse 4 M | Edwin C. Dodson B | Caroline Dunn 7 |
| Conshohocken, Pa. | John D. Hampton 10 | Joseph J. Quinn 3 C | E. Arnold Forrest 3 C | William T. Muldruo 3 C | Robert E. Landis 10 B | Julia H. R. Foley |

Table VIII-A.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Mayor (All elected) | City Clerk | City Attorney | City Engineer | Superintendent of Schools | City Librarian |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Coraopolis, Pa. | C. P. McLaughlin 1 | W. E. Cain 10 C | H. C. A. Hofacker 6 C | Edburn Cooper 20 C | J. C. Werner 10 B | |
| Corning, N. Y. | A. G. Hood 4 | William M. Gurnsey 2 M | Clarence Brisco 4 M | W. O. Drake 24 B | Hugh Gregg 2 B | Mary McCabe 8 B |
| Corpus Christi, Tex. | William Shaffer 2 | G. E. Meisenheimer 2 C | C. D. Johns 2 C | Worth Cottingham 1 C | E. H. Hereford | Mabel Smith |
| Corsicana, Tex. | J. W. Edens 4 | J. P. Welch 10 M | Charles T. Banister 4 E | W. W. McClendon M | W. H. Norwood | Mrs. M. C. Houston |
| Cortland, N. Y. | F. R. Thompson 1 | C. M. DeVany 1 M | C. L. O'Connor 1 M | A. R. Reilly 1 B | Leo T. Wilcox 2 | Mrs. B. J. Kellogg |
| Coshocton, Ohio | W. L. Craig | | | Lyman C. Lamm | A. C. Pence 10 | Margaret E. Sahling 4 |
| Council Bluffs, Iowa | Hugh P. Finerty 1 | William J. Guilfoyle 3 C | Proctor R. Perkins 1 E | Jack Boyne 1 E | J. A. True 5 B | Eva T. Canon 11 B |
| Covington, Ky.† | Joseph F. Pieper 3 | W. H. Ritte 1 A | S. L. Blakely 2 A | L. E. McCartt 5 A | Glen O. Swing B | Hilda Glaser 1 B |
| Cranston, R. I. | Ernest L. Sprague* | Caleb H. Kenyon 4 C | Edward W. Day* C | Elton F. Durfee | John K. Fenner 18 B | |
| Crawfordsville, Ind. | Bert E. May 4 | Clark Jones 4 E | Arthur McGaughey 4 M | William S. Harding 4 M | M. C. Darnall 5 | Myrtle Weatherholt 7 |
| Cudahy, Wis. | Joseph Wagner 4 | James F. Keller 6 E | L. S. McParland 4 E | Frank Schade 4‡ | J. R. Brandsmark 4‡ | |
| Cumberland, Md. | George W. Legge 1 | Harry H. Thayer 1 C | Lewis M. Wilson 1 C | Henry W. Schaidt 3 C | Charles L. Kopp‡ | Mary G. Walsh 4 |
| Cumberland, R. I. | Albert J. Collins 1 | Stephen Fanning 2 E | Hugh M. Devlin C | John E. Gill 3 C | Bernard F. Norton B | Lucia A. Dana‡ |
| Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio | J. W. Haines 1 | | A. L. Sidnell 3 | N. C. Beal | Gilbert Roberts 4 B | Laura Vaughn 2 |
| Dallas, Tex.† | Charles E. Turner 4 | Earl Goforth 10 C | Hugh S. Grady 3 C | F. N. Baldwin 3 A | N. R. Crozier 10 B | Cleora Clanton 9 B |
| Danbury, Conn. | G. Walter Morgan 4 | J. A. Deakin 4 E | Thomas A. Keating 6 C | Leslie A. Davis 1 C | Harold F. Dow 4 B | Hannah H. Morrison 7 B |
| Danvers, Mass. | Edwin Cook, Jr. | A. Preston Chase E | Daniel F. O'Rourke C | | Ivan G. Smith B | Bessie P. Ropes‡ |
| Danville, Ill. | John J. Belton 4 | M. E. Brown 4 M | Ray Foreman 4 M | W. H. Martin 4 M | C. E. Vance 3 B | Belle Seiwell 1 B |
| Danville, Va. | Harry Wooding 44 | C. B. Strange 9 C | A. M. Aiken 14 C | C. L. Scott, Jr. 9 C | G. L. H. Johnson B | Mrs. J. L. Hagan 7 C |
| Davenport, Iowa | Merle Wells 1 | Frank A. Hass 13 E | Harold Thuenen 1 M | Edward Stapp 1‡ | Frank Smart 29 B | Edna Giesler 2 B |
| Dayton, Ohio† | Charles J. Brennan 1 | O. F. Mauch 5 C | H. E. Beane 4 A | G. F. Baker 12 A | C. E. Courter 3 B | Paul North Rice 6 B |
| Daytona Beach, Fla.† | E. H. Armstrong 5 | F. R. Mills 2 C | M. B. Conklin 2 C | (Vacant) | George W. Marks | Jenny Morrill |
| Dearborn, Mich. | Clyde M. Ford 8 | Myron A. Stevens 6 E | James E. Greene 9 M | Fred R. Storrer 6 M | Ray H. Adams 19 | Isabelle Chaffin 14 M |
| Decatur, Ala. | James A. Nelson 16 | E. W. Collier 24 C | O. Kyle 2 C | | W. W. Benson 10 B | Mrs. E. A. Tillery 6 B |
| Decatur, Ga.† | Scott Candler* | Mrs. Mortie Stanley C | (Vacant) | (Vacant) | Lamar Ferguson B | Mrs. A. B. Burrus B |
| Decatur, Ill. | O. W. Smith 8 | J. J. Heger 20 C | W. J. Carey 8 M | E. K. McDonald 3‡ | William Harris 10 B | M. A. Dill 10 B |
| Dedham, Mass. | | | | | John Anthony B | Anna P. Rolland B |
| Del Rio, Tex. | T. M. Johnson 1 | E. F. Howard 1 C | Phil Foster 1 C | Paul Blevins 5 C | Roy M. Andrews 6 C | |
| Denison, Tex. | Clarence Scott 6 | C. C. Hicks 6 M | R. W. Stoddard 20 M | A. M. Brenneke 6 M | F. B. Hughes 30 B | |
| Denver, Colo. | George D. Begole 4 | Ben Draper 1 M | James D. Parriott 4 M | A. K. Vickery 14‡ | A. L. Threlkeld 8 B | M. G. Wyer 11 B |
| Derby, Conn. | G. P. Sullivan 10 | J. S. Donahue 28 M | William F. Healey | Vincent B. Clarke 22 C | Richard T. Tobin 4 B | Emma Lessey 17 B |
| Des Moines, Iowa | D. N. Lewis 3 | Sam Orebaugh 2 M | Fred T. VanLiew 3 M | John W. Budd 1‡ | A. W. Merrill 1 | Forrest Spaulding |
| Detroit, Mich. | Frank Couzens 2 | Richard Reading 9 E | Ray J. Kelly 2 M | Joseph S. Stringham 4‡ | Frank Cody 20 B | Adam Strohm 20 B |
| Dickson City, Pa. | Paul J. Motts | | | Francis Stone | P. M. Brennan | |
| Dodge City, Kans. | E. C. Gingrich 2 | E. C. Hathaway 17 C | C. H. Russell 2 C | Fred Kirkpatrick 16 C | W. M. Richards 5 B | Ora Vawter 7 B |
| Donora, Pa. | W. H. Watson 6 | George W. Allen 26 C | D. M. Anderson 10 C | L. G. Sphar 10 C | John E. Shambach | Mrs. H. G. Goodman 3 B |
| Dormont, Pa. | Chas. Chamberlin 5 | Harold L. Cloud 5 C | Alva C. Purdy 5 C | V. Ramsey & Co 10 C | Ralph Radcliffe 12 B | |
| Dothan, Ala. | I. C. Ezell 6 | I. P. Scarborough 7 C | O. S. Lewis 8 C | | C. C. Moseley 8 B | Thenie Johnson 8 B |
| Dover, N. H. | F. Clyde Keefe 1 | Maurice A. Blais 1 C | D. M. McDonough 1 C | Walter S. Wheeler 9 C | Chester L. Howe 1 B | Beatrice M. Jenkins 2 B |
| Dover, N. J. | John Roach, Jr. 5 | Joseph V. Baker 25 C | Sam C. Meyerson | Raymond Sharp 9 C | Rosell C. Bowlby 12 B | Martha A. Burnet 15 B |
| Du Bois, Pa. | W. H. Cawthra 3 | J. C. Weaver 25 | John J. Pentz 3 C | M. E. Milliren 5 C | R. W. Robinson 1 B | Carl Hull 3 B |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dubuque, Iowa† | M. R. Kane 2 | J. J. Shea 3 C | M. H. Czizek 20 C | W. H. Cullen 19 A | Earl Cline 5 B | Mae Clarke 16 B |
| Duluth, Minn. | S. F. Snively 14 | C. D. Jeronimus 6 C | B. W. Forbes 6 C | Thomas McGilvray 2‡ | Leonard Young B | Janet Morey* B |
| Dunkirk, N. Y. | W. L. Roberts 5 | A. W. Harling 3 M | Albert J. Foley 1 E | Albert G. Walter 3 E | F. R. Darling B | Viarda C. Brubeck 1 |
| Dunmore, Pa. | Thomas Ferguson | Andy OHora C | James McDonald C | Sam Mastrianni C | James R. Gilligan B | |
| Duquesne, Pa. | J. S. Crawford 18 | Charles E. Dorman 13 C | Lewis C. Burstin 1 C | Robert B. Dell 18 C | C. H. Wolford 25 B | Charles E. Wright 29 |
| Durham, N. C.† | W. F. Carr 2 | C. B. Alston 14 C | S. C. Chambers 16 C | H. W. Kueffner 21 C | W. F. Warren 2 B | Clara Crawford 10 B |
| East Chicago, Ind. | Andrew Rooney* | P. S. Halstead 9 E | Nick Stepanovich* M | Z. B. Campbell 9 M | Roy Feik 1 B | Frank Whitmore 7 B |
| East Cleveland, Ohio† | J. A. Chamberlain 1 | Grant T. Apthorp* C | E. A. Binyon 20 A | Max W. Garnett 17 A | W. H. Kirk 33 B | Sarah Miller 8 B |
| Easthampton, Mass. | W. F. Coyle 12 | William A. Walker 12 E | Joseph N. Donais 4 B | M. J. O'Neill 18 C | H. D. Casey 12 B | Emma H. Parsons 9 |
| East Hartford, Conn. | John J. Burke 4 | William E. Hines 4 E | Edward C. Carroll 4 M | George Zajicek 5‡ | Percival S. Barnes 17 B | Jessie Hayden 25 B |
| East Liverpool, Ohio | O. E. Greenawalt 1 | | R. Buzzard 1 E | George Bloomgren 4 M | H. G. Means | Mary H. Hall |
| East Moline, Ill. | Chas. F. Carpentier 6 | Arnold Neihaus 2 E | Ray Klingbiel 8 M | Robert Benell 6 M | D. B. Hoffman 18 B | Miss Falberg 3 B |
| Easton, Pa. | F. C. Roberts 3 | C. E. Rogers 3 C | N. R. Turner 20 C | C. A. Reese 23 C | James Bay 13 B | Henry F. Marx 33 B |
| East Orange, N. J. | Chas. H. Martens 14 | Alice I. Webster 2 C | Walter C. Ellis 10 M | Wm. D. Willigerod 24 M | Clifford J. Scott 12 B | Adeline Davidson B |
| East Providence, R. I. | James E. Dunne | William E. Smyth 34 E | William C. H. Brand 4 C | S. Frank Nolan | James R. Oldham B | Harriet M. Briggs 4 |
| East St. Louis, Ill. | James T. Crow 2 | Herman Zierath 4 C | Joseph McGlynn 4 C | W. McKay Brown 12 C | D. Walter Potts 24 B | J. Lyon Woodruff 31 B |
| Eau Claire, Wis. | D. D. Lockerby 1 | O. E. Oren 15 C | J. B. Fleming 20 C | A. R. Garnock 7 C | A. T. Stolen 2 B | Laura M. Olsen 24 B |
| Ecorse, Mich. | William W. Voisine 2 | Don H. Beckmann 2 E | Earl E. Montie 5 C | P. G. Brown C | Claude E. Miller 10 B | Mrs. Roscoe |
| El Dorado, Ark. | George R. Crossly | George W. Jackson 4 E | I. W. Stinnett E | | C. L. McClurkin‡ | Ruth Austin 1 |
| El Dorado, Kans.† | E. W. Grant 2 | C. Whiteside 4‡ | F. J. Leasure 1‡ | F. E. Schide 8‡ | J. F. Hughes 8‡ | Miss Austin 5‡ |
| Elgin, Ill. | Myron M. Lehman 4 | M. H. Brightman 4 E | Perry D. Wells 4 C | Victor H. Kasser 8 C | Theodore Saam 5 B | Katherine L. Abbott |
| Elizabeth, N. J. | Joseph A. Brophy* | Theo. W. Brokaw | Edward Nugent | Thomas E. Collins | Ira T. Chapman | Charles A. George |
| Elizabeth City, N. C.† | J. B. Flora 8 | L. E. Skinner, Jr. 1 C | J. W. Jennette 1 C | | E. E. Bundy 1 B | Doris Abbott 1‡ |
| Elkhart, Ind. | Clyde E. Paxson | H. P. Sisterhen E | Hawley Burke M | Robert H. Wilder M | J. F. Wiley B | Flora Case B |
| Ellwood City, Pa.† | Judd C. Turner 5 | E. B. Moyer 17 C | J. W. Humphrey 30 C | L. W. Monroe 7 C | V. R. DeLong 3 B | Catherine Charles 20 B |
| Elmhurst, Ill. | C. L. VanAuken 2 | F. N. Neumann 18 E | Fred C. Harbour 2 M | Edwin Hancock | George L. Letts 8 B | Grace M. Murray 9 B |
| Elmira, N. Y.† | Henry W. Honan 1 | F. J. Cassada 1 C | Philip E. Lonergan 1 A | Michael W. Wipfler 7 A | H. O. Hutchinson 14 B | Kate D. Andrews 14 B |
| Elmwood Park, Ill. | Thomas Carey 2 | H. A. Hommersand 1 E | Myron E. Wisch 5 C | | George Wells 4 B | |
| El Paso, Tex. | R. E. Sherman 4 | W. R. Collins 4 M | J. H. McBroom 7 M | H. G. Stacy 8 M | A. H. Hughey 16 B | Maud D. Sullivan 22 B |
| Elwood, Ind. | Orla A. Wann* | Cal H. Long* E | Geo. B. McCommon* M | Louis Diamond* M | William A. Smith 10 B | Lucille Snow 7 B |
| Elyria, Ohio | W. H. Vanoster 4 | Dan Symons E | Harvey Cheney M | J. M. Powell 16‡ | R. C. Maston 11 B | Charlotte Brooks 9 B |
| Emporia, Kans. | Frank Lostutter 3 | E. T. Mendel 14 C | O. L. Isaacs 9 C | Fred Humes C | L. A. Lowther B | Nora Daniel B |
| Endicott, N. Y. | Earl W. Travis 2 | G. H. Nichols 15 B | Peter D. Demary 1 B | C. F. Hunt 15 B | H. H. Crumb 22 B | Lucia A. Kelly 1 |
| Englewood, N. J. | I. S. Reeve 1 | T. J. Ahrens 5 E | F. H. Reeve 12 C | G. R. Hartley 4 C | W. J. White 22 | Florence G. Finney 15 |
| Enid, Okla. | Louis S. Morell 2 | W. A. Goltry 2 M | Harry Kirkendall 2 | John Huston 1 | Dewitt Waller 3 | Mable McClure |
| Erie, Pa. | James P. Rossiter 3 | M. J. Henry 3 C | Edward M. Murphy 3 C | A. N. Aitken 10 C | John C. Diehl B | Charlotte Evans B |
| Escanaba, Mich.† | Carl J. Sawyer 3 | Carl E. Anderson 18 C | H. J. Rushton 5 A | A. V. Aronson 9 A | R. E. Cheney 10 B | Margaret Pease 7 B |
| Euclid, Ohio | Charles R. Ely 10 | | Stanley L. Orr 10 E | I. T. Stewart 10‡ | W. B. Franks 16 B | Minnie Baeckler 4 B |
| Eugene, Ore. | Elisha Large 3 | C. M. Bryan* E | S. M. Calkins 8 M | W. C. Clubb 8 M | H. R. Goold 7 B | Alma Hendricks 2 B |
| Eureka, Calif. | F. R. Sweasey 4 | A. W. Kildale 15 E | J. W. Henderson 16 E | E. D. Gardner 8 E | George B. Albee 15 B | H. A. Kendal 15 B |
| Evanston, Ill. | Chas. H. Bartlett 10 | Edward W. Bell 10 E | Edward Arnold* M | A. W. Handford 10 M | J. R. Skiles | Ida Faye Wright |
| Evansville, Ind. | William H. Dress 1 | A. W. Ellerbush 6 E | Louis L. Roberts 1 M | Louis A. Geupel 1 M | Ralph Irons 3 B | Ethel F. McCullough 23 |
| Everett, Mass. | James A. Roche 1 | Frank T. Pettengill 11 | W. Henry Finnegan 1 | Joseph W. Holmes 8 | Frederick A. Ashley 3 | Georgia W. Rathbone 10 |
| Everett, Wash. | A. C. Edwards 3 | H. Arends 3 C | J. Y. Kennedy 3 C | G. G. Paine 1‡ | R. E. Cook | Mabel Ashley 15 B |

### Table VIII-A.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Mayor (All elected) | City Clerk | City Attorney | City Engineer | Superintendent of Schools | City Librarian |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fairfield, Ala. | C. N. Gilley 2 | C. D. Sallade 2 E | G. P. Benton 2 E | E. J. Bird 2 C | B. B. Baker 10 B | Evelyn Egbert 3 B |
| Fairhaven, Mass. | Thos. W. Whitfield 20 | Wm. D. Champlin 10 E | Charles Mitchell 4‡ | | Charles F. Prior 20‡ | Avis Pillsbury‡ |
| Fairmont, W. Va. | Andrew C. West 1 | M. M. Nutter 2 B | | H. C. Scott 6 B | A. L. Thomas | Mrs. W. H. Conaway |
| Fall River, Mass. | Alexander C. Murray* | E. F. Bergeron 3 C | H. S. R. Buffinton M | Thomas J. Logan M | H. L. Belisle B | Marjorie Wetherbee 4 B |
| Fargo, N. D. | Fred O. Olsen 2 | Carl O. Jorgenson 3 C | M. W. Murphy 6 C | W. P. Tarbell 8 C | J. G. Moore 14 | Inga L. Rynning 8 |
| Faribault, Minn. | N. S. Erb 2 | L. E. Zuehlke 4 C | L. A. Smith 2 C | I. F. Smith 6 C | H. H. Kirk 11 | Florence D. Love 10 B |
| Farrell, Pa. | J. A. Franek 3 | Lloyd S. Newton 3 C | B. F. Marks 3 C | J. W. Schwartz 3 C | W. W. Irwin 9 | |
| Fayetteville, N. C. | Q. K. Nimocks, Jr. 4 | Sallie W. Tomlinson 2 C | R. M. Lilly 2 C | W. W. Baker C | Horace Sisk | Sara A. Williams |
| Ferndale, Mich.† | Theo. L. Degenhardt 2 | T. H. O'Donoghue 2 C | O. C. Holmes 2 C | Roy F. Goodspeed 5 A | Edgar F. Down 9 B | Etta M. Vivian 6 B |
| Findlay, Ohio | Homer O. Dorsey 4 | J. K. Jacobs 4 M | C. E. Gladhart 2 E | O. C. Gohlke 13‡ | I. F. Mattison 15 B | Mary Morrison 20 B |
| Fitchburg, Mass. | R. E. Greenwood 2 | S. E. Worthington 8 C | Samuel Salny 2 M | Joseph M. Peirce 6 M | James McNamara 6 B | George Nutting 32 B |
| Flint, Mich.† | H. J. Clifford* | Ned J. Vermilya 6 C | Frank G. Millard 8 C | James R. Pollock 3 A | Leland H. Lamb 5 B | William Webb 7 |
| Floral Park, N. Y. | John McNeill 6 | John Blome 12 C | H. P. Herman 4 C | | Rena C. Hayden | Ada Hendrickson 12 B |
| Florence, Ala. | Lee Glenn | | | | J. W. Powell | Mrs. W. B. Ragsdale |
| Florence, S. C.† | H. K. Gilbert 20 | A. McTaggart 13 C | J. M. Lynch 20 C | | John W. Moore 15 B | Mrs. P. A. Willcox 8 B |
| Fond du Lac, Wis. | A. J. Rosenthal 2 | W. A. Coffman 4 C | A. L. Edgarton 3 C | G. W. Stanchfield | L. P. Goodrich 12 B | Leila Janes 17 B |
| Forest Park, Ill. | George R. Gold 8 | H. C. Huxhold 12 C | Elmer W. Arch 8 C | Robert W. Wallace 8 C | W. S. Dimmett 4 B | Beatrice Mitchell 4 B |
| Fort Collins, Colo. | H. H. Hartman 5 | A. J. Rosenow 16 C | Fred W. Stover 5 C | Burgis G. Coy 3 C | Ward I. Miller | Gwendolyn Edwards 4 C |
| Fort Dodge, Iowa | George Burnet 2 | D. J. Coughlan 4 C | D. G. Rider 2 C | P. W. Pollard | K. D. Miller | Isabella Gray 22 B |
| Fort Madison, Iowa | L. H. Childs 6 | L. F. Albers 18 C | J. W. Napier 6 C | R. J. Lewis 15 C | A. I. Tiss | Erma Hopley B |
| Fort Scott, Kans. | Harry C. Brooks 2 | Christena Luffel 23 C | Glen Louderback 2 C | Charles Coe 2 C | V. M. Liston 11 B | Mrs. J. R. Prichard 10 B |
| Fort Smith, Ark. | J. K. Jordan 2 | C. W. Steuart 4 C | Fadjo Cravens 2 C | Jay Medlin 7 C | J. W. Ramsey 12 B | Katie Pardew 11 B |
| Fort Thomas, Ky. | L. L. Ross 2 | Gertrude M. Leicht 9 C | Odis Bertelsman 6 C | C. H. Kuhn 5 C | D. W. Bridges B | |
| Fort Wayne, Ind. | Harry W. Baals* | L. H. Ellenwood* E | Walter Helmke* M | C. R. McAnlis* B | Merle Abbett 3 B | Rex M. Potterf* B |
| Fort Worth, Tex.† | Van Zandt Jarvis 2 | Henry Keller 3 C | R. E. Rouer 14 C | D. L. Lewis 16 A | W. M. Green 3 B | Mrs. Chas. Sheuber 33 B |
| Fostoria, Ohio | George R. Cameron 3 | E. K. Cunningham 10 M | Ora R. Wade 12 E | Charles A. Latshaw 3 M | James Reed 4 B | Ella I. Robbins 40 B |
| Framingham, Mass. | John J. Rice | William S. Walsh E | C. R. Halloran C | Samuel Dyer C | B. J. Merriam B | Edith B. Hayes B |
| Frankfort, Ind. | Dan Power | Carl V. Chittick E | Kenneth Power M | L. L. Fisher M | J. A. Linebarger B | Edith Thompson 10 |
| Frankfort, Ky. | C. T. Coleman 3 | Mervin Parrent 1 C | Frank M. Dailey 1 C | | J. W. Ireland B | Rebecca Gayle |
| Franklin, Pa. | J. G. Bohlender 1 | J. G. Crawford 20 C | M. P. Breene 6 C | John M. Snow 25 C | Karl M. Russell | Mary H. Clarke |
| Frederick, Md. | Lloyd C. Culler 10 | | Edward Smith 10 M | Elmer S. Maxwell 8 M | Eugene Pruitt 3 B | Mary Newman 12 |
| Freeport, Ill. | J. A. Ascher 2 | Carl J. Krueger 6 E | H. E. Wheat 2 M | Clyde E. Rhodes 6‡ | B. F. Shafer 4 E | Ruth Hughes 10‡ |
| Freeport, N. Y. | R. E. Patterson 2 | H. E. Pearsall 12 B | Raymond Malone 1 B | Herbert M. Wood 10 B | John W. Dodd 10 B | Alice Rogan 20 B |
| Fremont, Nebr. | J. F. Rohn 6 | A. J. Forman 14 E | Allan Johnson 6 M | L. M. Roessler 20 E | A. H. Waterhouse 25 B | Mildred Palmer‡ |
| Fremont, Ohio | Ed. J. Franks 1 | C. E. Dumminger 1 C | B. A. Fouche 1 E | Charles Hockenedel | H. Church 1 B | Bess B. Gressman 6 |
| Fresno, Calif. | Z. S. Leymel 6 | H. S. Foster 10 C | Claude L. Rowe 6 M | Jean L. Vincenz 6 E | C. W. Edwards 30 E | Sarah McCardle 20‡ |
| Fullerton, Calif. | W. L. Hale 7 | F. C. Hezmalhalch 18 E | Albert Launer 6 C | H. A. Hiltscher 2 | R. E. Green | Gertrude DeGelder B |
| Fulton, N. Y. | William C. Smith 1 | F. A. Campbell 1 M | E. F. Sullivan 1 M | H. S. Andrews 8 M | G. R. Bodley 8 B | Ethel Dunham 5 B |
| Gadsden, Ala. | George S. Vann 4 | H. C. Thomas 4 C | A. M. Rains 4 C | T. E. Walford 4 C | C. A. Donahoo B | Lena Martin B |
| Gainesville, Fla.† | M. H. Bayley 1 | Clarence O'Neil 4 C | Fred D. Bryant 8 C | R. T. Hargrave 8 A | Horace F. Zetrouer | Mary B. Swinney 1 |
| Galesburg, Ill. | Joe E. Anderson 4 | Ben J. Huff, Jr. 12 E | Eugene Hardy 8‡ | A. L. Richey 12‡ | O. O. Young 7‡ | Anna Hoover 25‡ |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Galveston, Tex. | J. E. Pearce | Mildred M. Oser C | B. F. Williams C | W. B. McGarvey C | E. G. Littlejohn B | Arthur R. Curry 1 |
| Gardner, Mass. | James A. Timpany 2 | B. F. Holden 12 C | A. E. Livingstone 2 M | Stanley G. Kendall 3 M | F. T. Reynolds 12 B | Barbara H. Smith 12 B |
| Garfield, N. J. | Charles Bleasby 1 | Joseph J. Novack 15 C | Joseph Matisovsky 1 M | Ralph Lowe 1 M | Earle Thompson B | Olga Katz 5 B |
| Garfield Hgts., Ohio | M. L. O'Donnell 3 | | Edward S. Crudele 3 E | John A. Petsche 3 M | Harold L. Maurer B | |
| Gary, Ind. | L. B. Clayton* | John Knotts* E | Harry Long 4 M | R. H. Atcheson* M | William Wirt 25 B | William Hamilton 12 B |
| Gastonia, N. C.† | E. B. Denny 6 | J. L. Kendrick 1 C | E. R. Warren 4 C | P. T. Withers | W. P. Grier 14 | Charlotte E. Blake |
| Geneva, N. Y. | H. T. Maxwell 5 | Harold H. Ranf 1 M | Albert Kirby 1 M | James W. Brennan 22 B | Lynn Houseman 10 B | Edith Enguist 5 B |
| Glen Cove, N. Y. | Harold F. Mason 1 | George E. Raynor 1 M | Augustus Wheeler 1 M | A. W. Leach 1 M | H. H. Chapman 16 B | Miss L. Allen 1 B |
| Glendale, Calif.† | Joseph F. Baudino 2 | Glenn E. Chapman 6 E | B. C. Brennan 5 C | Jack C. Albers 5 A | R. D. White 22 B | Bess R. Yates 2 B |
| Glens Falls, N. Y. | Irving Griffing | J. L. Conlin 1‡ | J. E. Singleton 1‡ | Herbert Reeves 2 M | A. W. Miller 7 B | Rebecca W. Wright 5 |
| Gloucester, Mass. | George H. Newell 2 | Allan F. Grant 20 C | Carlton Wonson 6 C | John H. Griffen 26 C | Ernest W. Fellows 12 B | Edna Phillips 1 |
| Gloucester, N. J. | Ernest Ritchie 1 | Daniel Lane 2 C | Vincent D. Costello 3 C | William Andrews 3 M | Charles T. Hassard 2 B | Josephine Carson 8 B |
| Gloversville, N. Y. | C. C. Thayer 1 | W. H. Marple 13 C | James H. Wood 10 C | H. J. Hanmer 25 C | Harry Langworthy 10 B | Lucy Edel 21 B |
| Goldsboro, N. C.† | J. H. Hill 6 | J. G. Spence 12 C | W. E. Blake 2 C | G. E. Whitman 2 A | Ray Armstrong 5 B | Mary DeVane 12 B |
| Goshen, Ind. | C. E. Firestone 5 | Ray M. Kitson* E | Ray Deahl* M | Orin B. Weaver* M | J. W. Foreman B | Elizabeth Rockwell 20 B |
| Grand Forks, N. D. | E. A. Flandland 1 | | Henry G. Owen 3‡ | E. L. Lium 8‡ | E. G. Schroeder 3 B | Ruth Brown B |
| Grand Island, Nebr. | T. M. Dillon 2 | Margaret Paulsen 2 E | Paul Holmberg 2 M | W. M. Wheeler 6 M | C. Ray Gates 13 B | Daisy Houck 25 B |
| Grand Junction, Colo.† | A. L. Holcombe 4 | Helen C. Tomlinson 9 C | Alex Bowie 2 C | James McGillis 1 A | R. E. Tope 17 B | Camille Wallace 22 B |
| Grand Rapids, Mich.† | William Timmers 1 | Jacob VanWingen 26 C | Ganson Taggart 16 A | Charles W. Darling 6‡ | Leslie A. Butler 11 B | Samuel H. Ranck 30 B |
| Granite City, Ill. | A. M. Jennings 2 | Edwin Rigg 14 E | Wesley Lueders 2 M | W. H. Morgan 2 M | Paul Grigsby 2 B | Olive B. Stallings 18 B |
| Great Falls, Mont. | M. C. Grinde 2 | W. H. Harrison 23 M | Charles Davidson 2 M | Gordon E. Pappin 1 M | Irving W. Smith 6 | Louise M. Fernald 22 B |
| Greeley, Colo. | Roy M. Briggs 2 | W. A. Hamnett 6 E | Robert G. Smith 4 C | R. W. Gelder 18 C | H. D. Eldridge 1 B | Helen Thomas 8 B |
| Green Bay, Wis. | John V. Diener 6 | A. W. Icks 2 C | Thomas C. Dwyer 7 C | Francis J. Steeno C | Henry Sutton 7 B | Sybil Schutte B |
| Greenfield, Mass. | Alvin H. Dobbrow 1 | Dana W. Parkhurst 1 E | Charles Fairhurst 1 C | Eugene L. Bond 1 C | Fred W. Porter 1 B | May Ashley 1 B |
| Greensboro, N. C.† | Roger W. Harrison 2 | G. C. Eichhorn 4 C | Andrew Joyner, Jr. 7 C | Ray Warren 10 A | Guy B. Phillips 7 B | Nellie M. Rowe 15 B |
| Greensburg, Pa. | Harry N. Yont 8 | Herbert Wirsing 8 C | Robert L. Potts 8 C | F. E. Maddocks 7 C | Wm. H. McIlhattan 1 B | |
| Greenville, Miss. | M. C. Smith 2 | Guy Drew 19 C | S. B. Thomas 6 C | F. E. Hall 8 C | F. W. Murphy 2 B | A. Worthington 18 C |
| Greenville, S. C. | John M. Mauldin 2 | B. F. Dillard 2 C | B. A. Morgan 2 C | Dan A. Hulick 2 C | J. L. Mann | Fanny T. Taber 3 B |
| Greenville, Tex. | A. S. Moore 3 | Mord Hale 2 E | R. L. Porter, Jr. 2 E | | Joe L. Bergin 3 B | Ida Pennington 20 C |
| Greenwood, Miss. | G. L. Ray* | Bonner Duggan 7 M | A. H. Bell | Charles Abbott 2 C | W. C. Williams 12 B | Sanders Smith 5 B |
| Greenwood, S. C. | W. A. Barnette | | | J. Hearst Coleman | W. E. Black | Mary Ferguson |
| Griffin, Ga.† | W. B. Harris 1 | H. P. Powell 2 C | J. O. Futral 3 C | H. P. Powell | G. W. Wannamaker 4 B | Mrs. M. A. Longdon 15 B |
| Grosse Pte. Park, Mich. | Alfred J. Garska 7 | Waldo J. Berns 18 E | Julius L. Berns 17 M | Charles H. Marden 14 M | S. M. Brownell | Florence H. Severs 7 |
| Gulfport, Miss. | J. W. Milner 11 | Ivan Ballenger 2 E | J. L. Heiss 22 M | H. D. Shaw M | B. F. Brown 12 B | Clara I. Bradley B |
| Hackensack, N. J.† | Robt. A. Altschuler 2 | Ethel M. Hoyt 2 C | Donald M. Waesche 2 C | Myron Hendle | John A. Wilcox 3 B | Mary E. Boggan |
| Hagerstown, Md. | Irvin M. Wertz 2 | Scott R. McKane 2 M | E. R. Roulette 2 M | S. L. Greenawalt 2 M | B. J. Grimes 15 | Nellie C. Chrissinger |
| Hamilton, Ohio† | Raymond H. Burke 7 | Adele Edmonds 7 C | Millikin P. Shotts 6 A | Arthur Smalley 6 A | D. R. Baker 4 B | Hattie James 20 B |
| Hammond, Ind. | Frank R. Martin 4 | Arthur H. Spoerner 4 E | Harry Stilley 4 M | Clarence Mason 4 M | L. L. Caldwell B | James A. Howard B |
| Hamtramck, Mich. | J. A. Lewandowski 1 | F. Matulewicz 3 E | T. A. Machrowicz 1 M | George J. Jerome 7 M | M. R. Keyworth 12 B | Miss I. McRae 12 M |
| Hannibal, Mo. | J. B. Robinson 6 | R. W. Isbister 2 C | F. B. Hulse 6 E | G. W. Farrell 6 C | E. T. Miller 8 B | Ethel Birch 16 B |
| Hanover, Pa.† | John H. Little 5 | A. S. Ruth 21 C | Robert M. Laird 2 C | C. A. Eckbert 8 C | C. V. Erdly 2 B | Mabel C. Wolcott 15 B |
| Harlingen, Tex. | Sam Botts 6 | D. D. Norton 6 M | Polk Hornaday 3 M | A. Tamm 15 M | E. C. Deering* B | Mrs. C. A. Macy |
| Harrisburg, Ill. | G. B. Hart 4 | Vera Serviss 7 C | K. D. Cummins 7 C | | Roscoe Puliam B | Bernice Wiedemann B |
| Harrisburg, Pa. | Geo. A. Hoverter 16 | Herman A. Earley 1 C | Paul G. Smith 4 C | Clark E. Cowden 9 C | Martin H. Thomas 5 B | Alice R. Eaton 22 |
| Harrison, N. J. | Fred. J. Gassert 4 | F. J. McDonald 11 M | Michael J. Bruder 2 M | John J. Bracken 20 M | John P. Murray 3 B | Alma M. Lewis 18 B |

## Table VIII-A.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Mayor (All elected) | City Clerk | City Attorney | City Engineer | Superintendent of Schools | City Librarian |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hartford, Conn. | Joseph W. Beach 2 | John A. Gleason 15 E | Barclay Robinson 2 M | Roscoe N. Clark 23 M | Fred D. Wish, Jr. 12 B | T. R. Temple 8 |
| Harvey, Ill. | F. W. Bruggemann 8 | F. C. Norton 8 M | John T. Whitehead 4 M | P. G. Robinson 8‡ | E. E. Bratcher 3‡ | M. Brock 4‡ |
| Hastings, Nebr. | C. G. Ingraham 6 | L. T. Waterman 2 E | Roscoe S. Hewitt 4 M | P. T. Naylor 15 M | A. H. Staley 16 B | Margaret Fulmer 2 B |
| Hattiesburg, Miss. | W. S. F. Tatum | | | R. A. Chapman | W. I. Thames 13 | Lois V. Rumph 5 |
| Haverhill, Mass. | Geo. E. Dalrymple 2 | Robert H. Quinby 5 C | James P. Cleary* C | Louis L. Lawton 23 C | Albert L. Barbour 15 B | D. K. Campbell 14 B |
| Hawthorne, N. J. | Arthur Rhodes | | | Salvador Missonellie | F. H. Thomas | Harriet d'Archambaud |
| Hazleton, Pa. | R. Alvan Beisel 3 | Ira Mann 17 C | John H. Bigelow 33 C | Jerry Rough 16 C | A. D. Thomas 14 B | Alice Willigerod 22 B |
| Helena, Mont. | C. J. Bausch 3 | V. N. Kessler 18 C | J. W. Mahan 2 C | O. A. Baarson 2 C | R. O. Evans B | Mabel T. Miller 10 |
| Hempstead, N. Y. | W. T. Chamberlin 8 | Eugene P. Parsons 23 C | | C. F. McLaughlin 2 C | W. A. Gore | Adelaide M. Faron 8 |
| Henderson, Ky. | L. L. Hurley 1 | H. N. Helm, Jr. 1 C | N. B. Hunt 1 C | N. W. Neel 7 C | C. E. Dudley 15 B | Sue S. Towles 20 B |
| Herkimer, N. Y. | Fred W. Sauer | | | D. Bennett Rasbach | Loraine W. Bills | Edith M. Sheaf 28 |
| Hibbing, Minn. | A. B. Timmerman | V. L. Cole E | T. H. Strizick C | Clark Henry | J. W. Richardson B | Nancy J. Venberg B |
| Highland Park, Ill. | Emil B. Metzel 4 | V. C. Musser 8 C | E. S. Gail 4 C | | R. H. Price | Cora Hendee 8 |
| Highland Park, Mich. | Joseph M. Hackett 1 | T. E. Shawcross 4 E | Earl B. Young 3 C | L. C. Whitsit 18 C | I. M. Allen 8 B | Katharyne Sleneau 15 B |
| High Point, N. C.† | C. S. Grayson | Lois Welborn 4 C | G. H. Jones 4 A | S. H. Strickland 8 A | T. W. Andrews 11 B | Nancy Poston 3 A |
| Hoboken, N. J. | Bernard N. McFeely 9 | Arthur C. Malone 3 C | Horace Allen 16 C | Joseph Wittemore 17 C | Daniel Kealey 17 C | Nina Hatfield 13 C |
| Holland, Mich. | Nicodemus Bosch 9 | Oscar Peterson 8 E | Elbern Parsons 1 C | Jacob Zuidema 20 C | E. E. Fell 20 B | Dora Schermer 20 B |
| Holyoke, Mass. | Henry J. Toepfert 3 | John F. Sheehan 34 | R. L. Davenport 2 M | Philip E. Bond 10 M | William R. Peck 16 B | F. G. Willcox 35 |
| Homestead, Pa. | John Cavanaugh 13 | Harry Markley 9 C | P. H. McGuire 13 C | M. J. Haupt 4 C | P. Eckels B | Wm. F. Stevens 34 |
| Hopewell, Va.† | D. L. Elder | Louise Strickland 10 C | J. H. Hening 1 C | L. A. Sims 18 C | R. W. Copeland 4 B | Mrs. W. J. Nelson 3 C |
| Hopkinsville, Ky. | S. L. Peace 1 | Mrs. C. Russell 8 C | James Higgins 1 C | Charles Vaughn 20 C | G. Koffman 4 B | Virginia Schum 16 B |
| Hoquiam, Wash. | Ralph L. Philbrick* | Ola E. Hall 2 E | James P. Callahan 8 M | W. L. Lovejoy* M | H. C. Crumpacker 8 B | Marion A. Taft 1 B |
| Hornell, N. Y. | Leon F. Wheatley 1 | Ernest G. Stewart 3‡ | Harry L. Allen 3‡ | F. Hurd Robinson 27‡ | Harrison Dodge | Helen G. Thacher 20‡ |
| Hot Springs, Ark. | Leo P. McLaughlin 8 | Emmett Jackson 1 E | A. T. Davies 8 E | L. R. Plemmons 2 M | H. H. Haley 7 B | |
| Houston, Tex. | Oscar F. Holcombe 10 | Sterling Hogan 2 M | R. R. Lewis 2 M | J. M. Nagle 5 M | E. E. Oberholtzer 10 B | Julia Ideson 25‡ |
| Hudson, N. Y. | Frank W. Wise 1 | Charles E. Hopkins 3 M | John J. Moy 1 M | J. M. Wardle 5‡ | M. C. Smith 12 B | Lydia C. Trimper |
| Huntington, Ind. | C. W. H. Bangs* | Wallace Reed* E | Claude Cline* M | James Adkins* M | Jesse Scudder 20 B | Priscella McArthur 15 B |
| Huntington, W. Va. | Martin V. Chapman* | Fred W. Schoew* M | Frank Eaton* M | Roy W. Breece 5 M | R. B. Marston 1 B | Miss Lewis Harvey 3 B |
| Huntington Park, Calif. | Richard G. Schulz 5 | William P. Mahood 9 E | D. A. Hessick 4 C | Vaughn Wood 3 C | | |
| Huntsville, Ala. | A. W. McAllister 8 | N. M. Payne 5 C | M. H. Lanier 8 C | G. W. Jones 12 C | W. G. Hamm 9 B | Mrs. M. P. Darwin 15 B |
| Huron, S. D.† | E. T. Gitchell 5 | M. F. Walt 11 B | George Longstaff 1 B | O. A. Ricker 8 B | Andrew J. Lang | Blanche Battin 3 B |
| Hutchinson, Kans. | C. L. Burt 2 | H. R. Obee 10 M | W. A. Huxman 2 M | R. B. Lee 2 M | G. W. Gowans 2 B | Lucy Nichols 2 B |
| Independence, Kans. | Ralph C. Mitchell 4 | G. H. Krienhagen 24 C | Chester Stevens C | G. H. Hackmaster 11 C | J. H. Clements 8 B | Anna Gemmel 27 B |
| Independence, Mo. | Roger T. Sermon 11 | James S. Craig 26 M | John F. Thice 20 M | Robert H. Jones | E. B. Street | Carrie Wallace 15 |
| Indianapolis, Ind. | John W. Kern* | Daniel O'Neill, Jr.* E | Floyd J. Mattice* M | Henry B. Steeg* M | Paul C. Stetson 3 B | Luther Dickerson 4 B |
| Inglewood, Calif. | Raymond V. Darby 4 | Otto H. Duelke 13 E | Clyde Woodworth 22 C | Arthur W. Cory 6 C | Robert E. Cralle | Lenore Forker |
| Iowa City, Iowa | Harry D. Breene 2 | George J. Dohrer 16 C | Thomas Martin 2 C | Jay F. Sproatt 2 C | Ivar Opstad 10 B | Jessie Gordon 8 B |
| Irondequoit, N. Y. | | Fred E. Hussey 1 C | | | Wallace A. Rayfield 25 | |
| Iron Mountain, Mich. | Gereon Fredrickson 2 | H. C. Lindholm 12 E | E. J. Dundon 2 M | H. L. Senseman 8 C | John Jelsch | Lucile Monroe |
| Ironton, Ohio† | | Don Hopkins 10 C | F. A. Ross 10 C | F. E. Hardy, Jr. 3 A | Carl E. Larsen 3 B | Helen Cloran |
| Ironwood, Mich.† | O. W. Schneider 2 | Leo Adriansen 9 C | William G. Cloon 4 A | James Goudie 9 A | E. A. Erickson | Eileen FitzGerald 7 B |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Irvington, N. J. | Percy Miller, Jr. 4 | W. H. Jamouneau C | H. P. Bedford 1 C | I. J. Casey, Jr. 4‡ | H. Libby 5 B | May E. Baillet B |
| Ithaca, N. Y. | L. P. Smith 4 | J. E. Matthews 10 B | F. H. Stephens 2 M | H. W. Eustance 9 B | C. L. Kulp 5 B | Dorothy Wightman 7 |
| Jackson, Mich.† | W. W. Wright 1 | C. H. Vedder 25 M | B. E. Brower 3 E | R. B. Jackson 3 A | Harold Steele 5 | Dorothy Dowsett 4 A |
| Jackson, Miss. | Walter A. Scott 18 | A. J. Johnson 15 C | W. E. Morse 10 C | J. J. Halbert 6 C | J. G. Chastain, Jr. 2 B | Mrs. A. M. Parker 20 C |
| Jackson, Tenn. | Lawrence Taylor 16 | D. W. Tuckey* C | W. P. Moss 10 C | E. R. Dike 16 C | C. B. Ijams 18 C | Allie Drake 20 B |
| Jacksonville, Fla. | J. T. Alsop 11 | W. C. Almand 1 E | Austin Miller 9 C | W. E. Sheddan 13 C | R. C. Marshall 3 | J. F. Marron 15 B |
| Jacksonville, Ill. | W. A. Wainright 2 | John R. Phillips 2 E | Orville N. Foreman M | | R. O. Stoops B | Charlotte Ryan B |
| Jamestown, N. Y. | Leon F. Roberts 1 | Joseph Midgley 1 M | Adolph F. Johnson 1 M | Leland L. Graham 1 M | George Persell 1 B | Lucia T. Henderson 29 |
| Janesville, Wis.† | | M. A. Puerner 11 A | R. A. Cunningham 6 A | James Lustig 10 A | L. A. Creutz 6 B | Bernice Colby 1 B |
| Jeannette, Pa. | Harry W. Leyh* | J. Claire Manson 7 C | Fred B. Trescher 3 C | L. J. Schnupp* C | E. Wilbur Long 16 B | |
| Jefferson City, Mo. | Means Ray | | | Richard D. Fowler | William F. Knox 9 | Julia Andrae 1 |
| Jeffersonville, Ind. | Allen W. Jacobs 4 | John A. Kennedy 4 E | Joseph Warder 4 M | Harry E. Jacobs 4 M | E. G. McCullum 8 B | Mrs. Poindexter 12‡ |
| Jersey City, N. J. | Frank Hague 18 | Michael J. Gill 2 C | James A. Hamill 3 C | James Henderson 5 C | James A. Nugent 11 B | Edmund W. Miller 20 B |
| Johnson City, N. Y. | William W. Benjamin 2 | C. R. Nimmons 8 M | Roy M. Page 2 M | James C. Adams 8 M | Howard Eccleston 5 B | Harriet J. Stiles |
| Johnson City, Tenn. | B. B. Snipes 4 | E. J. Quillen 4 C | J. H. Chalkley 4 B | W. O. Dyer 2 B | Roy G. Bigelow 2 B | Annemay Vandiver 4 |
| Johnstown, N. Y. | Harry A. Jenner 5 | Arch Wands 7 C | Alfred D. Dennison 4 M | Clarence Knowles 17 C | Earl L. Ackley 25 B | Katharine Seaman |
| Johnstown, Pa. | Eddie McCloskey 3 | John W. Cramer 24 | Tillman K. Saylor 22 | H. Lee Wilson 14 | Dale McMaster* | Helen Berkey 43 |
| Joliet, Ill. | William A. Hennessy | Arthur Blackburn | J. W. Faulkner | A. S. Calkins | A. Perrin | Rena Barickman |
| Jonesboro, Ark. | H. J. Bosler 12 | James Carr Cobb 1 E | Chas. Frierson, Jr. 1 E | Shelley Lee | Fred Keller 8 B | Mary C. Neely 8‡ |
| Joplin, Mo. | A. C. Maher 1 | Maude E. Fones 12 C | Emerson Foulke 1 C | J. B. Hodgdon 4‡ | E. A. Elliott 5 B | Blanche Trigg 3 B |
| Kalamazoo, Mich.† | Wm. Shakespeare, Jr. 1 | C. Ray Howard 7 C | Lynn B. Mason 3 C | Edw. S. Clark 14 A | Harold C. Hunt 2 B | Flora B. Roberts 17 B |
| Kankakee, Ill. | Dode Rex 2 | F. L. Fister 2 E | Samuel Shapiro 2 M | Robert D. Gregg 2 M | Mr. Bouchard B | Dorothy Brown 2 M |
| Kansas City, Kans. | Don C. McCombs 8 | Howard Payne 20 | A. H. Skinner 5 | C. E. Peterson 4 | F. L. Schlagle 3 | Oliver Q. Claflin 3 |
| Kansas City, Mo.† | Bryce Smith 5 | Charles Regan 9 M | George Kingsley 5 A | Robert Waddell 9‡ | George Melcher 7 | Purd B. Wright 24 |
| Kearny, N. J. | Arthur H. Jones 5 | William B. Ross 26 E | Thomas G. Walker* C | Arthur Brokaw 2 C | Edmund Tink 3 B | M. B. Kilgour 25 B |
| Keene, N. H. | Geo. F. T. Trask 1 | Frank H. Whitcomb 37 C | John R. Goodnow 2 E | Ralph H. Clark 9 C | L. O. Thompson 1 B | Mary L. Saxton 24 B |
| Kenmore, N. Y. | Edw. Leininger 5 | Walter Ducker 11 C | Elton M. Dale | (Vacant) | Frank C. Densberger B | Margaret Hirschieser 4 B |
| Kenosha, Wis.† | | | R. V. Baker, Jr.* A | Robert M. Smith 1 A | G. F. Loomis 14 B | Cora Frantz 22 B |
| Keokuk, Iowa | F. A. Willmering 3 | B. F. Earl 3 C | John E. Newkirk 3 C | C. J. Nelson C | R. L. Reid B | Nan P. Fulton B |
| Kewanee, Ill. | James H. Andrews 16 | J. G. Thorne 4 C | Charles E. Mulligan 16 C | J. G. Thorne 4 C | Charles Bruner 14 B | Elizabeth Curry 5 B |
| Key West, Fla. | William H. Malone 3 | Wallace Pinder 16 E | J. Lancelot Lester 10 C | B. Curry Moreno 12‡ | Melvin E. Russell 10 | Mary E. Wardlow |
| Kingsport, Tenn.† | W. L. Holyoke 1 | | H. L. Garrett 3 A | O. L. King 1 A | R. N. Robinson B | Mrs. T. E. Hurst 5 B |
| Kingston, N. Y. | C. J. Heiselman 2 | E. J. Dempsey 2 M | M. V. Cahill 2 M | H. D. Darrow 2 M | B. C. VanIngen B | Cornelia Goodrich 9 |
| Kingston, Pa. | H. E. Cameron 1 | C. H. Blochberger 10‡ | William J. Fahey 3‡ | Robert L. Williams 5‡ | J. R. Merkel 16 | Margaret Jackson 8 |
| Kinston, N. C. | D. F. Wooten | T. W. Heath | | John E. Weyher | W. A. Graham 8 | Grace Ipock |
| Klamath Falls, Ore. | Willis E. Mahoney 2 | | J. H. Carnahan‡ | E. A. Thomas 6‡ | J. P. Wells | Enola Hawkins 8‡ |
| Knoxville, Tenn.† | John T. O'Connor 4 | W. H. Stapleton 7 C | W. H. Peters, Jr. 11 A | Hal H. Hale 2‡ | Harry Clark 5 B | Helen M. Harris 1 B |
| Kokomo, Ind. | Olin R. Holt* | Mel Good* E | Carl J. Broo* M | George Morrow* M | C. V. Haworth 22 B | Dana Sollenberger 17 B |
| Lackawanna, N. Y. | Paul J. Tomaka 2 | Anthony Jusczak 2 | Rudolph Weinstein 2 C | T. M. McCormick 8 C | Clarence Conway 2 B | Jasmine Hardleben 2 B |
| Laconia, N. H. | Chas. E. Carroll 4 | Earl Flanders 20 E | Harold E. Wescott | Charles A. French B | John S. Gilman | Hazel J. Clark 18 B |
| La Crosse, Wis. | Joseph J. Verchota 12 | Fred L. Kramer 8 E | Oscar J. Swennes 16 C | John Barth C | J. M. Wiley B | Lilly Borresen 20 |
| Lafayette, Ind. | W. N. Teal 1 | Jack LeFevre 1 E | E. B. Davidson 1 M | Harry B. Overesch 1 M | Morris McCarty 2 B | Hazel Randolph B |
| Lafayette, La. | Robert L. Mouton 4 | Wilson J. Peck 12 | J. J. Davidson, Jr. 4 C | Val E. Smith 4 C | John Falk 10 | Mrs. J. J. Davidson, Jr. |

## Table VIII-A.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Mayor (All elected) | City Clerk | City Attorney | City Engineer | Superintendent of Schools | City Librarian |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lagrange, Ga. | R. S. O'Neal 1 | J. H. Moss 1 M | J. T. Thomasson 1 M | G. H. Sargent 1 M | F. F. Rowe 1 B | Jeanett Wilhoit 1 B |
| La Grange, Ill. | W. P. Saunders 6 | H. H. Mitchell 2 E | George M. Stevens 14 M | Edwin Hancock 14 M | John Davies 10 B | Rebecca Ditto 4 B |
| Lake Charles, La. | J. A. Trotti 10 | Mrs. E. H. Squires 12 | Alvin O. King 10 | | Ward Anderson 14 | Mrs. C. M. Dees 20 |
| Lakeland, Fla.† | E. A. Goodwin* | J. L. Davis 12 C | A. R. Carver 2 C | B. H. Roquemore 3 A | Carl S. Cox 1 B | Serena C. Bailey 5 A |
| Lakewood, Ohio | A. I. Kauffman 3 | H. A. Rees 3 M | R. G. Curren 5 M | E. A. Fisher 21 M | George Bowman* B | Miss R. Ingam 17 |
| Lancaster, Ohio | Charles E. Moyer | | Esther H. Brocker E | W. W. Graf‡ | C. L. Berry B | Edith Baumgardner B |
| Lancaster, Pa. | James H. Ross 1 | William J. Coulter 1 C | J. Andrew Frantz 1 C | R. L. Keel 1 C | H. E. Cress 11 | Margaret Critchfield |
| Lansing, Mich. | Max A. Templeton 2 | Bertha Ray 11 E | Joseph W. Planck 1 M | S. C. Jacka 2 M | Jay W. Sexton B | E. Jennie McNeal B |
| La Porte, Ind. | Lemuel Darrow | Carl E. Anderson E | Leonard Henoch 5 M | John Hupp, Jr. M | E. B. Wetherow 12 B | Mary Maxwell 1 B |
| Laredo, Tex. | Albert Martin 9 | A. R. Garcia 15 E | M. J. Raymond 3 E | F. C. Heins 6‡ | J. W. Galligan 7‡ | |
| La Salle, Ill. | H. M. Orr | Bertha Young C | W. J. Aplington C | Edward Byrne C | J. B. McManus C | Bessie Davis C |
| Latrobe, Pa. | John L. Ackerman 1 | E. M. Eaton 5 C | James B. Weaver 20 C | Gibson Thomas 10 C | John G. Hulton 10 B | Miss McComb 5‡ |
| Laurel, Miss. | G. W. Hosey 2 | John M. Williams 2 C | J. R. Buchanan 2 C | E. H. Odem 2 C | R. H. Watkins 28 B | Olive Moncrief 6 |
| Lawrence, Kans. | W. E. Spalding 2 | A. E. Woestemeyer 4 C | George K. Melvin 1 M | B. M. Babb 7‡ | C. E. Birch 3 B | Lillian Constant B |
| Lawrence, Mass. | Walter A. Griffin 2 | John J. Daley C | Walter A. Rockefort C | Robt. W. Priestman‡ | Bernard M. Sheridan B | William A. Walsh |
| Lawton, Okla. | Walter Fuller 2 | Nettie Pippin 2 E | Charles E. Bledsoe 2 M | W. H. Drover 2 M | B. C. Swinney 10 B | Mamie Small 6 B |
| Leavenworth, Kans. | Jack H. Miller 2 | Edward W. Schaaf 4 B | Malc. McNaughton 2 M | | Ira J. Bright 15 B | Elsie Evans 15 B |
| Lebanon, Pa. | J. K. R. Schropp 3 | George H. Biely 1 C | A. Harry Ehrgood 3 C | S. Allen McAdam 3 C | R. R. Abernethy 1 B | Mrs. Harry Spahn B |
| Leominster, Mass. | Sidney E. Bell 2 | Charles D. Harnden 9 E | James H. P. Dyer 15 M | | W. H. Perry 20 B | Florence Wheeler 32 B |
| Lewiston, Me. | R. J. Wiseman 2 | G. E. Ouellette 3 M | Alton Lessard 2 M | John A. Jones 50 M | Chas. W. Bickford 24 B | Annie L. Barr 12 B |
| Lewistown, Pa. | Geo. B. Keim 5 | H. E. Fetterolf 13 C | Harry L. Siegel 4 C | M. C. Chandler 10 C | Denton M. Albright 1 B | Kate Swan |
| Lexington, Ky.† | Chas. R. Thompson 1 | C. W. Fithian 1 A | J. Pelham Johnston 3 A | J. White Guyn 22 A | Henry Hill 5 B | Florence Dillard 14 |
| Lima, Ohio | A. L. Metheany 1 | A. J. Filliez 1 M | Charles Long 1 E | James Brakes 1 M | R. E. Offenhauer | Georgie McAfee |
| Lincoln, Ill. | John G. Krieg* | Cloyd F. Gerard 8 E | Uri Kissinger 20 M | Albert Heitmann 4 M | D. F. Nickols | Ida M. Webster |
| Lincoln, Nebr. | Fenton B. Fleming 2 | Theo. H. Berg 22 C | Max Kier 6 C | D. L. Erickson 11 C | M. C. Lefler 14 B | Lulu Horne 24 B |
| Lincoln, R. I. | | David D. Johnston 30 E | | Howard R. Smart 15 C | John L. Smith 10 C | |
| Lincoln Park, Mich. | A. P. Zirkaloso 4 | J. M. O'Connor 8 E | F. G. Mixter 4 M | E. H. Pate 10 B | Leo Huff 8 B | Miss Million 6 M |
| Linden, N. J. | Myles J. McManus 3 | Thomas J. Wieser 1 E | Lewis Winetsky 1 C | James Davison 2 C | D. A. Howell 28 B | Viola R. Maihl 7 B |
| Little Falls, N. Y. | A. B. Santry 4 | Dennis Reardon 4 M | Richard Conley M | Ralph Austen 9 M | C. C. Ring 1 B | Mabel E. Richards 27 B |
| Little Rock, Ark. | H. A. Knowlton 4 | H. C. Graham 1 E | E. I. McKinley 1 E | W. H. Marak 4 M | R. C. Hall 25 B | Vera Snook 9 C |
| Lockport, N. Y. | H. F. Thurston 1 | D. J. Thurston 1 M | J. J. Sullivan 1 M | J. F. Frehsee 1 M | Roy B. Kelly 13 B | Helene M. Prudden 13 B |
| Lodi, N. J. | Michael Cavallo 2 | Joseph D. Pacella | Benj. P. Galanti 6 M | Arthur Noack 6 M | H. V. Matthews 12 B | Susan Hunderman 8 B |
| Logansport, Ind. | William O. Fiedler 5 | D. A. Middleton E | B. F. Long 3 M | Joseph Hubertz M | W. L. Sprouse B | Alice D. Stevens B |
| Long Beach, Calif.† | Carl Fletcher 1* | E. L. Macdonald* C | G. M. Trammell, Jr. 1 E | E. M. Edwards* A | H. S. Upjohn 3 B | Theodora Brewitt 13 A |
| Long Branch, N. J. | Dorman McFaddin 3 | Frank A. Brazo 3 B | J. Steinbach, Jr. 3 B | D. W. Morris 3 B | Charles Stone 5 B | Mary Clarkson |
| Longview, Wash. | Martin Stenerson* | Mabel E. Larimore 4 E | J. C. McCoy* E | Jack Jones | E. J. McNamara | Weyana Lapp 3 B |
| Lorain, Ohio | E. A. Braun 1 | Arthur J. Smith 1 C | Wesley L. Grills 9 E | Henry F. Alexander 3 M | D. J. Boone 21 B | Margaret T. Grant 6 B |
| Los Angeles, Calif. | Frank L. Shaw 2 | Robt. Dominguez 14 M | Ray L. Chesebro 2 E | Lloyd Aldrich 2 B | Frank A. Bouelle 6 | Althea Warren 3 B |
| Louisville, Ky. | Neville Miller 1 | | M. Beauchamp 1 M | James B. Wilson 1‡ | Fred Archer 3 B | Harold Brigham 3 B |
| Lowell, Mass. | James J. Bruin 1 | Perry D. Thompson 4 M | Redmond E. Welch 1 M | Stephen Kearney 20 M | V. M. McCartin 1 B | Fred A. Chase 30 B |
| Lubbock, Tex.† | Ross Edwards 1 | W. O. Stevens 1 M | E. L. Klett 9 M | M. R. Smith, Jr. 8 M | K. E. Oberholtzer 1 | Lola Mae Rozzell 3 |
| Lynbrook, N. Y. | Howard G. Wilson 8 | Harold E. Dana 4 C | Raphael W. Alpher 4 C | Carman Dunne, Inc. 8 B | Charles Vosburgh 31 | Theresa Guertin 5 C |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lynchburg, Va.† | L. E. Lichford 1 | John M. Otey 30 C | T. Gibson Hobbs 8 C | M. D. Knight, Jr. | Omar Carmichael 2 B | J. Maud Campbell 13 |
| Lynn, Mass. | J. Fred Manning 5 | Joseph W. Attwill 37 C | Patk. F. Shanahan 14 C | Frank E. Gowdy 4 C | Harvey Gruver 12 B | Helen Luitwieler 6 B |
| McAlester, Okla.† | W. C. Tippit 1 | Helen R. McDonald 8 A | W. J. Horton 17 A | V. G. Thompson 3 C | M. J. Hale 5 B | Phoebe Hayden 23 B |
| McComb, Miss. | Xavier A. Kramer 6 | B. E. Butler 17 C | (Law Firm) C | | J. E. Gibson 12 B | Mrs. Joe Lilly 2* |
| McKeesport, Pa. | George H. Lysle 21 | James E. Crossland 15 C | Harry M. Jones 15 C | L. F. Savage 18 C | J. B. Richey 33 B | Araminta McLane 6 B |
| McKees Rocks, Pa. | P. J. Henney | D. E. Shannon | Leo J. Aaron | W. C. Lyle | Gale F. Stroup | |
| Macon, Ga. | Herbert Smart 1 | Viola Ross Napier 7 C | E. W. Maynard 7 C | Watson Walker 9 C | Walter P. Jones 8 B | Sally May Akin 12 |
| Madison, Wis. | James R. Law 2 | A. W. Bareis 2 C | J. T. Harrington 1 C | T. F. Harrington 1 C | R. W. Bardwell 7 B | Mary A. Smith 25 B |
| Mahanoy City, Pa. | P. J. Foley 1 | T. P. McLaughlin 6 E | M. J. Ryan 1 C | Fred Metz | H. A. O'Day 18 B | |
| Malden, Mass. | John D. Devin 8 | Bessie L. Holden 4 C | Bernard Kaplan 3 C | Henry W. Estey 39 M | F. G. Marshall 24 B | Herbert E. Fison 30 B |
| Mamaroneck, N. Y.† | Henry T. Hornidge 2 | F. H. Bull, Jr. 3 C | Anthony Sansone 3 C | C. A. Latimer 4 A | A. Z. Boothby 18 | Eleanor Merrow 6 |
| Manchester, N. H. | Damase Caron 3 | Michael J. Quinn 3 C | C. J. Belanger 3 C | Francis B. Kenney 1 B | L. P. Benezet 9 B | F. Mabel Winchell 33 B |
| Manhattan, Kans. | Harold Westgate 1 | A. L. Hjort 1 B | Charles Hughes 4 M | Wilbur Cole 3‡ | W. E. Sheffer 9 B | Mary C. Lee 31 B |
| Manitowoc, Wis. | Martin Georgenson 10 | Arthur H. Zander 16 C | Clarence Teitgen 10 M | Theo. Staeffler 8 M | Hugh Bonar 10 B | Florence Dunton 8 B |
| Mankato, Minn. | Charles K. Mayer 2 | F. W. Bates 23 C | C. E. Gilmore 13 C | A. M. Kircher 2 C | J. E. Anderson 2 B | Clara C. Bordwell 4 B |
| Mansfield, Ohio | Charles M. Lantz 3 | William J. Beer, Jr. 5 C | William F. Black 5 E | W. C. Statler 14 M | W. W. Ankenbrand 1 B | Mildred W. Sandoe 4 |
| Maplewood, Mo. | John D. Fels 2 | John Hogan 2 C | C. A. Altenbernd 2 C | Evert C. Meyers, 1 C | George Dille 6 B | |
| Marietta, Ohio | J. Morton Harper 1 | Karl Rock 1 M | E. E. Erb 1 E | W. H. Heiby 1‡ | Henry L. Sullivan 6 B | Willia D. Cotton 34‡ |
| Marinette, Wis. | R. P. Murray 8 | John Moore 21 M | Chas. F. Kuchenberg 6 M | A. L. Hillis 30 M | G. E. Denman 4 B | Miss Lang 6 B |
| Marion, Ind. | Carl F. Barney 4 | Ray E. Norman 4 E | Robert Caine 4 M | Wilmer Wilson 4 M | Elbert E. Day B | Daisy Springer |
| Marion, Ohio | C. A. Bolin 1 | J. A. Raub 1 C | Theodore Ochs 1 E | T. S. Cathers 15‡ | C. A. Hudson | Helen L. Kramer 5 |
| Marlborough, Mass. | Charles A. Lyons 4 | Peter B. Murphy 52 M | Fred L. Williams 1 M | J. Francis Granger 8 M | Ernest P. Carr B | Katherine Gorman 2 B |
| Marquette, Mich. | Arthur F. Jacques 1 | Mary A. Hogan 14 C | John J. Walsh 6 C | Chas. C. Cummings 20 C | W. M. Whitman 15 B | Miss M. H. Smith 8 B |
| Marshall, Tex.† | N. C. Matthewson 4 | Newman Wells 2 C | William Caven 10 C | W. C. Albright 7 A | J. P. Buck 1 B | Eleanor H. Wooden |
| Marshalltown, Iowa | G. W. Darling 4 | Anne McMahon 15 C | W. D. Kearney 2 C | F. S. Naiden 4 C | W. F. Shirley 13 B | Alice Story 10 B |
| Martinsburg, W. Va. | C. H. Dailey 6 | S. M. Langford 10 M | H. A. Downs 6 M | C. J. Wever 12 M | Bessie D. Kilmer | Mary C. Stribling 8 M |
| Martins Ferry, Ohio | Edgar H. Irwin 2 | R. A. Blackford, Jr. 2 M | F. W. Ellis 2 E | H. L. Werker 2 B | A. L. Koehler 4 B | Wilma T. Adams |
| Mason City, Iowa† | J. J. Burns 1 | J. H. McEwen 31 C | Lester Dibble 2 C | C. H. Stevens 10 A | J. B. Irons 5 B | Lydia Barrette B |
| Massena, N. Y. | T. S. Bushnell 4 | O. T. McGuiggan 6 C | C. H. Chase 3 C | O. T. McGuiggan 6 C | E. W. Simmons | Helena A. Taylor |
| Massillon, Ohio | William Limbach 2 | Carl D. Zepp 2 E | Lewis C. Wiggins 2 E | C. E. Rice 10 B | H. R. Gorell 10 B | Florence Hulings 5 B |
| Mattoon, Ill. | E. E. Richardson 2 | John W. Gibler 4 E | Jacob Berkowitz 2 M | William E. Miller | H. B. Black B | Blanche Gray B |
| Maywood, Ill. | Henry W. Tolsted 14 | B. W. Ward 4 E | J. E. Dittus 6 C | William Thomas 5 C | Eugene La Rowe 26 B | Isabel G. Horne 2 B |
| Meadville, Pa. | Fred C. Kiebort 1 | G. S. Maxwell 8 C | A. D. Andrews 14 C | R. L. Phillips 21 C | W. D. Norton B | Helen Dermitt B |
| Medford, Mass. | John J. Irwin 2 | Charles A. Winslow 20 | John E. Howard 2 M | H. J. Nicholson 7 M | J. Stevens Kadesch 5 B | Mary H. Davis 5 B |
| Medford, Ore. | George W. Porter 1 | M. L. Alford 18 E | Frank P. Farrell 6 M | D. T. McDonough 2 M | O. G. Smith | Eva Fay Woolsey 14 |
| Melrose, Mass. | Robert A. Perkins 4 | Victor C. Kirmes 10 C | Thomas McKie 3 M | Fred E. Ellis | Herman H. Stuart 11 B | Elsie M. Hatch 13 B |
| Melrose Park, Ill. | Joseph Imburgio 2 | A. W. Hahn 6 E | P. W. Brust 6 M | (Private Firm 6 M) | Eugene LaRowe 26 B | Alma Wolf 10 B |
| Memphis, Tenn. | Watkins Overton 7 | D. C. Miller 7 M | William Gerber 1 C | William B. Fowler 17 C | R. L. Jones 14 B | Jesse Cunningham 20 B |
| Menominee, Mich. | A. G. Cherney 3 | A. B. Siegel 10 C | K. O. Doyle 2 C | T. R. Hasley 18 C | John Silvernale 20 B | Gladys Larson 6 B |
| Meriden, Conn. | Stephen L. Smith 3 | Ruth E. Payne 3 E | Robert M. Dowling* | C. Perry Prann 3 | Nicholas Moseley | Martha Bartlett |
| Meridian, Miss. | C. Vinson 2 | M. L. Rush 2 C | Howard Westbrook 2 C | John C. Watts 24 C | H. M. Ivy 10 B | Mrs. T. L. Bailey 2 B |
| Methuen, Mass. | Arthur Nicholson | J. T. Douglas 20 E | Paul R. Clay 1 C | | Lewis H. Conant 8 B | Beatrice Wekel 10 B |
| Miami, Fla.† | E. G. Sewell 2 | H. E. Ross 13 C | J. W. Watson, Jr. 10 C | C. S. Nichols 10‡ | Charles M. Fisher 14 E | Alla Webb 1 |
| Michigan City, Ind. | R. C. Fedder* | Frank Wentland* E | L. W. Cannon* M | Francis Frame* M | M. C. Murray B | Marie Wilcox B |
| Middlesborough, Ky. | Ike Ginsburg 1 | Edw. L. Johnson 3 C | A. W. Rharer 1 C | C. P. Davidson 10 C | J. W. Bradner 10 B | Dorthy Sprague 3 B |

TABLE VIII-A.—DIRECTORY OF CITY OFFICIALS IN ALL CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued

| City | Mayor (All elected) | City Clerk | City Attorney | City Engineer | Superintendent of Schools | City Librarian |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Middletown, Conn. | Leo B. Santangelo* | Henry Bacon* E | Don Cambria* M | G. Allen Schaefer 11 M | Fred Shearer 7 B | Nathaly E. Newton 9 |
| Middletown, N. Y. | Harry Terhune 1 | Percy E. Benedict 2 M | S. W. Eager 1 M | Justin F. Gates 4 M | Ernest H. Burdick 10 B | Grace I. Winslow 3 B |
| Middletown, Ohio† | | Harry C. Kempf 1‡ | Fred J. Schatzman 1‡ | Louis P. Diefenbach 1‡ | R. W. Solomon 18‡ | Emma E. Hale 20‡ |
| Milford, Mass. | J. H. Gardella 2 | Dennis J. Sullivan 28 E | W. A. Murray 4 C | | A. O. Caswell 27 B | Miss E. Blake 10 B |
| Millville, N. J. | Harry F. VanHook 2 | John H. Fisher 10 C | Harry S. Waltman 4 C | Newton B. Wade 21 C | W. G. Pate 1 B | Emma Shaw 2 B |
| Milton, Mass. | Frederick A. Gaskins 3 | G. Frank Kemp 20 E | Lincoln Bryant 19 C | Forrest J. Maynard 7 C | Horace F. Turner 7 B | Carrie S. Allen 10 B |
| Milwaukee, Wis. | Daniel W. Hoan 19 | Frank Krawczak 3 C | Max Raskin 3 E | J. P. Schwada 12 M | M. C. Potter 21 B | M. S. Dudgeon 15‡ |
| Minneapolis, Minn. | A. G. Bainbridge 2 | Charles C. Swanson 8 C | R. S. Wiggin 2 C | Fred T. Paul 2 C | Carroll Reed 6 B | Gratia Countryman 31 B |
| Minot, N. D.† | J. A. Patterson 2 | | V. E. Stenerson 2 C | L. G. Wilhelm 2 A | L. A. White 17 B | Katherine McSherry 13 B |
| Mishawaka, Ind. | Edward C. Went* | Ralph J. Vance* E | Irving A. Hurwich* M | Walter G. Wiekamp* M | P. C. Emmons B | Ella Hodges B |
| Missoula, Mont. | Ralph L. Arnold 1 | Harry M. Rawn 3 C | J. C. Garlington 1 C | W. E. Swearingen 4 C | Ira B. Fee 16 B | Nina Ford 1 B |
| Mitchell, S. D. | George Fredericks 6 | | C. S. Whiting 2 M | J. C. Scallin 9 M | J. C. Lindsey 20 B | Lora Crouch 4 B |
| Moberly, Mo. | L. O. Nickell 4 | Otto A. Swoboda 4 C | Marion Lamb 2 E | George Shipp M | M. F. Beech 15 B | Carrie Elsea 10 B |
| Mobile, Ala. | Cecil F. Bates* | S. H. Hendrix | Harry Seale | Harry L. Fisher | W. C. Griggs 8 | Emma Harris 14 |
| Modesto, Calif. | Roy E. Pack 2 | H. E. Gragg 12 C | A. J. Carlson 19 C | F. J. Rossi 11 C | J. H. Bradley 8 B | Bessie Silverthorn 17 B |
| Moline, Ill. | A. Henry Arp 2 | Mrs. A. N. Brissman 6 E | Glenn A. Trevor 2 M | Robert M. Benell 16 M | E. P. Nutting 4 B | Alice Williams 8 B |
| Monessen, Pa. | James Gold 1 | John C. Lermann 13 C | Vincent R. Smith 13 C | | Samuel Fausold 5 B | |
| Monroe, La. | A. Bernstein 16 | | H. H. Russell 20‡ | W. I. Neel 12‡ | E. L. Neville 30‡ | Mrs. J. M. Townes 1 |
| Monroe, Mich. | D. A. Knaggs 1 | John H. Eber 7 E | William F. Haas 1‡ | Stuart M. Weaver 5 C | George Cantrick 6 B | Mary Crowther B |
| Monrovia, Calif. | George H. Williams 5 | F. A. Dupar 5 E | Paul F. Garber 1 C | G. H. Duell 5 C | J. W. Ayer 3 B | Ann Crews 10 B |
| Montclair, N. J. | Oscar L. Carlson 3‡ | Joseph McKee 1 M | George S. Harris 4 M | Edgar F. Martin 1‡ | Frank G. Pickell 11 B | Margery C. Quigley 8 B |
| Montgomery, Ala. | W. A. Gunter 16 | W. L. Jackson 16 C | J. L. Goodwyn 5 C | J. M. Garrett 10 C | W. H. Harrison 16 B | Laura Elmore 16 C |
| Morgantown, W. Va.† | G. W. Phillips 1 | Russel K. Bolton 1 C | Kermit R. Mason 1 A | Elmer W. Prince 8 A | Floyd B. Cox 2 E | Betty Berry 3 B |
| Morristown, N. J. | W. Parsons Todd* | Nelson S. Butera 9 C | N. C. Toms C | | Burton Wiley 10‡ | Grace D. Rose 8 |
| Moundsville, W. Va. | Paul R. Ruble 4 | John F. Hopkins 2 E | Paul E. Bottome 2 E | Gordon W. Sammons 2 C | S. J. Anderson | Ida Hankins |
| Mount Carmel, Pa. | Elmer Delcamp 1 | E. J. Fincato 1 C | Louis Cohen 1 C | Harry Jones 1 C | Gerald Bierschmitt B | |
| Mount Clemens, Mich. | D. R. Westendorf 1 | Joseph H. Matthews 4 C | B. V. Nunneley 2 C | E. L. Pettingill 1‡ | L. W. Fast 10‡ | Ann Crocker 5‡ |
| Mount Vernon, Ill. | Edgar Miller 2 | J. M. Ayers 2 E | Kirby Smith 2 M | C. L. Stratton 2 M | Howard E. Bosley | Margaret Pittman 2 M |
| Mount Vernon, N. Y. | Leslie V. Bateman 3 | Thomas J. Dooling 1 C | Frank A. Bennett 3 M | Charles Hick 40 M | William H. Holmes 20 | Frances Thomson 15 B |
| Muncie, Ind. | Rollin H. Bunch 1 | Linton Ridgeway 6 E | Lon Bracken 1 M | A. K. Meeker 1 M | D. W. Horton 3 B | Sallie Robard 1 B |
| Munhall, Pa. | Enoch L. Jones 1 | L. Y. Woodward 7 C | J. B. McAdoo 15 C | F. B. Sheaffer 25 C | C. R. Stone 15 B | |
| Muscatine, Iowa | Herman Lord 2 | F. D. McKinney 4 E | Harvey Allbee 2 E | H. H. Fitzgerald 12 E | Henry VanHettinga 6 E | C. Rynsburger 8 B |
| Muskegon, Mich.† | W. W. Richards 15 | Ida Christensen 15 C | C. E. Farmer 15 C | Harry Lewis 10 A | J. A. Craig 5 B | Tefft Hewitt 10 B |
| Muskegon Hghts., Mich. | Edw. J. Lorenz 2 | R. J. Miles 2 M | William J. Balgooyen 2 M | George F. Liddle 2 M | W. R. Booker | |
| Muskogee, Okla.† | John Reynolds 2 | W. H. Cavanagh 5 C | Forrest Brewster 5 A | Max Williams 4 A | J. R. Holmes 4 | Cora C. Porter 10 B |
| Nanticoke, Pa. | Evan J. Williams 6 | Anthony Pilarek 2‡ | Raymond Livingston 4‡ | F. Kielar 4‡ | A. P. Diffendofer 24‡ | |
| Nashua, N. H. | Alvin A. Lucier 2 | Arthur L. Cyr 27 | W. A. Joyce 2 | Fred L. Clark 7 | Earl Tracy | Clara E. Smith |
| Nashville, Tenn. | Hilary E. Howse 12 | Silas H. McKay 15 M | J. W. Moore 15 M | F. O. Beazley 2 M | H. F. Srygley 6 M | F. K. W. Drury 3 B |
| Natchez, Miss. | S. B. Laub | | | | W. H. Braden | Lily T. Carson |
| Natick, Mass. | James Powers 1 | James Fleming 1 E | William Hall 1‡ | Benjamin Sargent‡ | Clifford Hall 1‡ | Mira R. Partridge |
| Naugatuck, Conn. | John J. Sheridan 1 | Charles F. Daly 1 B | Martin E. Gormley 1 B | Robert Beardsley 7 B | Harold Chittenden C | Jessie F. DeShong 5 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Needham, Mass. | Parkman D. Howe 2 | Clarence E. Foss 11 E | Gilbert W. Cox 2 C | Frank L. Cheney 1 C | Harry Brown 1 | Barbara Abbott 3 C |
| New Albany, Ind. | Jacob G. Hanswald 1 | Joel M. Ford 1 E | Roger H. Phillips 1 M | M. M. Boland 10 M | H. A. Buerk 20 B | Annette L. Clark 17 |
| Newark, N. J. | M. C. Ellenstein 1 | H. S. Reichenstein 1‡ | Frank A. Boettner 6‡ | James W. Costello 16‡ | John Logan 7‡ | Beatrice Winser 6‡ |
| Newark, Ohio | Charles F. Martin 3 | Howard J. Fleming 3 C | James M. Schaller 3 E | Charles H. Wells 33‡ | O. E. Pore 1 B | Mary H. Pierce 15 B |
| New Bedford, Mass. | Charles S. Ashley 31 | R. A. Swan, Jr. 11 | Fisher Abramson 1 | George F. Nye 21 | Allen P. Keith 16 | George H. Tripp 16 |
| New Bern, N. C. | L. C. Scott 2 | F. T. Patterson 2 E | W. H. Lee C | | H. B. Smith B | Frances J. Howerton |
| New Britain, Conn. | David L. Dunn 1 | Harry Scheny 3 E | David L. Nair C | George Molleur B | Stanley H. Holmes B | Greta E. Brown B |
| New Brunswick, N. J. | John J. Morrison 20 | John Boyce 4 C | Thomas H. Hagerty 20 C | Asher Atkinson 20 C | F. J. Sickels 12 B | Fred Bestow 8 B |
| Newburgh, N. Y.† | Chester J. Brown 3 | Miss A. P. Templeton 9 C | Raphael A. Egan 1 A | Chas. R. Woodhull 1 C | Marion W. Longman B | Lillian Estabrook 16 B |
| Newburyport, Mass. | Gayden W. Morrill 3‡ | H. W. Little 28 C | Malcolm N. Ayers 3 M | | Charles R. Thibadeau* B | Frank N. Jones 1 B |
| New Castle, Ind. | Sidney E. Baker 5 | John Rutlidge 1 E | Chester M. DeWitt 8 M | Ernest L. Guyer 9 M | E. J. Llewellyn 18 B | Feryl Sipe 1 B |
| New Castle, Pa. | Charles B. Mayne 3 | William T. Burns 3 C | Robert White 3 C | G. H. Hoskins 2 C | C. C. Green 4 B | Alice Sterling 14 B |
| New Haven, Conn. | John W. Murphy 3 | Abraham Zweigbaum 3 E | Nelson R. Durant 2‡ | Edw. S. Nettleton 15 M | John C. McCarthy 1 B | Lindsey Brown 10 B |
| New Kensington, Pa. | Daniel Burns 1 | Louis Heinle C | Louis Claster 1 C | R. M. Douglass 1 C | E. T. Chapman 15 B | |
| New London, Conn.† | C. D. Twomey 1 | Edward S. Neilan 1 C | Thomas E. Troland 9 C | George E. Watters 14 A | Warren A. Hanson 17 B | F. W. Edgerton 17 |
| New Orleans, La. | T. S. Walmsley 5 | Thomas J. Hill 5‡ | E. M. Robbert*‡ | P. H. Quinlan 5‡ | Nicholas Bauer 12 B | E. A. Parsons 3 B |
| New Philadelphia, Ohio | Earl D. Gross 1 | Rey L. Swinderman 1 E | Clayton L. Renner 1 E | Albert Rosch 3 C | H. S. Carroll | Helen Olmstead 2 |
| Newport, Ky.† | Fred C. Weber 3 | K. C. Rainey 1 A | L. W. Scott 3 A | A. H. Root 9 A | A. D. Owens 8 B | H. Litzendorf 21 B |
| Newport, R. I. | Mortimer A. Sullivan 12 | W. Norman Sayer 4 C | J. A. Sullivan 25 C | Harry R. Hamilton* C | Harold T. Lowe 2 C | A. Louise Cottrell 3 |
| Newport News, Va.† | R. W. West 3 | A. M. Hamilton 12 C | S. R. Buxton 1 C | J. C. Biggins | Joseph H. Saunders | Mrs. Evans B |
| New Rochelle, N. Y.† | Paul M. Crandell 1 | Eugene M. Heiney 5 C | Aaron Simmons 1 A | Frank L. Clarke 8‡ | Clifford S. Bragdon 3 B | Aubrey Lee Hill 1 B |
| Newton, Iowa | F. M. Woodrow 2 | H. J. Lammers 3 C | George Campbell 6 C | Grant Carney | B. C. Berg 10 B | Gypsy Patton 20 B |
| Newton, Kans.† | Lyle L. Dickey 1 | Adella Martin 28 A | Fred Ice 2 A | Knowland L. Brode 4 C | J. B. Heffelfinger 12 | Lydia A. McGaughey 10 |
| Newton, Mass. | Sinclair Weeks 5 | Frank M. Grant 25 C | Joseph W. Bartlett 15 M | William P. Morse 11 M | Julius Warren 1 B | Julius Lucht 10 B |
| New York, N. Y. | Fiorello H. LaGuardia 1 | Michael J. Cruise 14 C | Paul Windels 1 M | Vernon S. Moon 1 B | William J. O'Shea 11 | Harry M. Lydenberg* B |
| Niagara Falls, N. Y.† | Frank A. Jenss 3 | George J. Rickert 17 C | George E. Carrie 3 A | H. Wesley Clark 4 A | J. F. Taylor 8 B | Bertha Cudebec B |
| Niles, Mich. | John E. Ames 1 | C. G. Wasson 3 E | C. R. Grathwohl 2 M | V. N. Taggett 14 | F. W. Crawford 10 | Orril Coolidge 31 B |
| Niles, Ohio | E. C. Ferguson 4 | Homer Thomas 25 C | Howard A. Mills 2 E | R. D. MacLean 3 B | S. J. Bonham 2 B | Ida J. Sloan 15 B |
| Norfolk, Nebr. | George W. Phelps 2 | A. O. Hazen 1 E | M. S. McDuffee 1 M | H. H. Tracy 24 M | Allen Burkhardt 4 B | Laura Durland B |
| Norfolk, Va.† | W. R. L. Taylor 1 | John D. Corbell 4 C | John W. Sebrell 6 C | W. H. Taylor, III | C. W. Mason B | Mary D. Pretlow 18 B |
| Norristown, Pa. | James W. Potter 2 | F. Lester Smith 8 C | Russell J. Brownback 1 C | Samuel Hart 4 C | H. O. Dietrich 10 B | Helen Bomberger 15 B |
| North Adams, Mass. | William Johnson 8 | William G. Carter 10 E | John N. Alberti 2 M | | G. C. Bowman 12 B | Elizabeth Furst 6‡ |
| Northampton, Mass. | James P. Boland 2 | John P. Foley 2 E | Alvertus D. Morse 2 M | William I. Baucus 11B | Fayette K. Congdon 30 B | J. L. Harrison 23 B |
| North Attleborough, Mass. | Thomas R. Norton 2 | John A. Rose 11 E | George L. Connors 15 C | Herman Razee 10‡ | George W. Morris 17 B | Ethel M. Rix 7 B |
| North Braddock, Pa. | G. Fenton Mitchell 8 | John O. Jones 35 C | Joseph F. Mayhugh 21 C | H. S. Harrop 1 C | F. D. Zuerner B | |
| North Little Rock, Ark. | U. E. Moore 4 | O. W. Neely 4 E | Joe N. Wills 3 E | | T. H. Alford 1 B | |
| North Platte, Nebr. | F. L. Temple 8 | E. J. VanDerhoof 10 E | J. T. Keefe 8 M | R. F. Nosky 10 M | W. J. Braham 12 B | E. M. Wheeler 12 B |
| North Providence, R. I. | | Louis A. Sweet 30 E | Francis J. Kiernan* E | | James J. McGuire 6 B | Arthur Sharp |
| North Tonawanda, N. Y. | R. R. Pullen 5 | J. M. Zimmerman 7 M | Joseph Ambrusko, Jr. 1 E | A. P. Smith 1 M | C. L. Moss 4 B | Helen P. VanVoorhees 13 |
| Norwalk, Conn. | Charles C. Swartz 1 | LeRoy D. Downs 1 C | Paul R. Connery 1 M | Paul J. James 1 C | Philip A. Jakob 2 B | Margaret S. Wilson 4 |
| Norwich, Conn. | Edward G. Moran | | | Elmer Pitcher | Edward J. Graham 23 | Rosina S. Hamilton 3 |
| Norwood, Mass.† | | J. E. Pendergast 20 C | James A. Halloran 25 E | A. W. Thompson 7 A | L. W. Grant 7 B | Jane A. Hewett 37 B |
| Norwood, Ohio | Allen C. Roudebush 1 | Laurence E. Collins 1 C | William M. Fridman 1 E | W. Allen Stone 1 M | C. W. Johnson 12 B | Alice Isphording 4‡ |
| Nutley, N. J. | W. F. Reinheimer 3 | Simon Blum 18 C | Edwin J. C. Joerg 3 C | D. R. Shepard 3 C | John A. Spargo* B | Irene C. Phillips 21 B |
| Oakland, Calif.† | Wm. J. McCracken 2 | William W. Chappell C | F. Bert Fernhoff 1 C | W. N. Frickstad 5 A | E. W. Jacobsen 1 B | John B. Kaiser 8 B |
| Oak Park, Ill. | Willis McFeely 11 | H. N. Leadaman 17 E | F. W. Pringle 11 M | D. C. Meyers 12 M | W. J. Hamilton 18 B | Elsie McKay 10 B |

TABLE VIII-A.—DIRECTORY OF CITY OFFICIALS IN ALL CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued

| City | Mayor (All elected) | City Clerk | City Attorney | City Engineer | Superintendent of Schools | City Librarian |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ogden, Utah | Harmon W. Peery 1 | Ella O. Ballantyne 1 M | George S. Barker 1 M | Claude L. Coray 1 C | Carl W. Hopkins 16 B | D. Wheelwright 5 B |
| Ogdensburg, N. Y. | Ralph J. Morissette 4 | W. Hobart Owens 5 M | R. S. Waterman 13 M | Charles H. Lord 17‡ | Arthur J. Laidlaw 15 B | Ella Rambles* B |
| Oil City, Pa. | J. G. Payne 3 | C. S. Hetrick 16 C | S. N. Mogilowitz 7 C | B. B. Weber 22 C | R. A. Baum 9 B | Miss F. Trosh 9 B |
| Oklahoma City, Okla.† | Tom E. McGee 1 | M. Peshek 26 A | Harlen Deupree 6 C | Lee M. Bush 4 A | C. K. Reiff 4 B | Mabel Peacock 21 A |
| Okmulgee, Okla. | M. F. Moroney 3 | Harry DeVinna 1 E | R. J. Bellman 3 C | Walter Wheatley 9 E | Max Chambers 3 B | Mrs. W. D. Elrod 3 M |
| Old Forge, Pa. | Louis Pagnotti | | | M. Manzo, Jr. | B. T. Harris | |
| Olean, N. Y. | F. W. Forness, Jr. 1 | William T. Donigan 1 M | J. E. McAuliffe 3 M | G. R. Miles 18 M | Wm. C. Greenawalt 15 | Maud D. Brooks 16 |
| Olympia, Wash. | F. A. Longaker* | O. U. Tatro*‡ | Thomas L. O'Leary*‡ | Charles H. Williams 6‡ | Leland P. Brown B | Lillian Collins B |
| Olyphant, Pa. | John L. Kilcullen 6 | | Stanley M. Evans 4 E | Brinley Lewis‡ | John M. Dempsey 4‡ | |
| Omaha, Nebr. | Roy N. Towl 3 | Emmett Hannon 3 C | Seymour L. Smith 3 C | Harry Trustin 3 E | Homer Anderson 3 B | Bertha Baumer 3 C |
| Oneida, N. Y. | Joseph Maher 1 | Hermann A. Philipp 1 M | Frank Nemeti 1 M | Albert Ernenwein 6 M | Albert H. Covell 6 B | Nellie Mirick |
| Oneonta, N. Y. | F. H. Marx 3 | A. C. Holley 3 M | J. B. Jackson 5 M | F. M. Gurney 22 C | George J. Dann 20 B | Mrs. E. Blackhall 11 B |
| Ontario, Calif. | L. S. Davidson 3 | C. C. Peabody 3 E | E. H. Jolliffe 13 C | Austin Burt 7 C | C. W. Randall | Alberta Schaeffer 4 B |
| Orange, N. J. | Walter B. Savage 1 | Wm. F. Christiansen 5 C | Edward R. McGlynn 3 M | Kenneth Crane 12‡ | W. Burton Patrick B | John B. Fogg 4 |
| Orlando, Fla. | V. W. Estes 1 | J. A. Stinson 11 C | Merton Horrell 1 C | Laurence Brown | J. B. Walker 2 E | Olive Brumbaugh 12 B |
| Oshkosh, Wis. | George Oaks 2 | James Chase 2 M | Lewis Magnussen 2 M | Fred Wolverton 2 M | C. C. Bishop 3 B | Natalie Huhn 1 B |
| Oskaloosa, Iowa | George E. Burdock 2 | W. J. Ireland 2 C | William Spencer* C | D. B. Russell 12 C | R. B. Newman 10 B | Elizabeth Michener 2 B |
| Ossining, N. Y. | William H. Jackson 13 | Lewis H. Acker 8 C | A. W. Hendrickson 9 C | E. Ward Applebee 10‡ | Harold Loomis 2 B | Carrie Davis 10 B |
| Oswego, N. Y. | R. G. Cullivan 1 | Charles J. O'Hara 2 M | Harry C. Mizen 1 M | Charles H. Snyder 7 M | Fred. Leighton 15 B | Juanita Kersey B |
| Ottawa, Ill. | H. J. Hilliard 8 | H. W. Farnsworth 8 C | Joseph D. Carr 4 C | H. A. Tolburg 8 C | C. J. Byrne 25 B | Vilda P. Beem 10 B |
| Ottumwa, Iowa | Edwin Manning 6 | Alvah C. Orvis 4 M | R. R. Ramsell 4 C | Henry Cook 6 C | Roy F. Hannum 8 B | May Ditch 10 B |
| Owensboro, Ky. | Fred Weir 1 | | O. L. Fowler 6 | C. A. Brown 6 | J. L. Foust 15 | Sue R. McCulloch 13 |
| Owosso, Mich. | A. T. Wright 12 | G. A. VanEpps 6 C | Van R. Pond 15 C | N. I. Raymond 11 C | E. J. Willman 15 B | Maud C. Thompson 1 C |
| Paducah, Ky.† | E. G. Scott 3 | Rudy Stewart 3 A | W. V. Eaton 1 A | (Vacant) | H. L. Smith B | Harriet Boswell 8 B |
| Painesville, Ohio† | | W. L. Clipp 9 C | Seth Paulin 7 C | C. S. Fullerton 2 C | C. C. Pierce | Ruth Pierce |
| Palestine, Tex. | J. H. Handorf* | Irma L. Campbell 1‡ | E. T. McCain‡ | S. R. Buchanan‡ | Bonner Frizzell‡ | Georgia McMeans‡ |
| Palo Alto, Calif. | Earl C. Thomas 3 | E. L. Beach 10 C | Arnold Rumwell 2 C | J. F. Byxbee 25 B | A. C. Barker 15 B | Anne Hadden 5 B |
| Pampa, Tex.† | W. A. Bratton 3 | Mabel Davis 1 A | John Sturgeon 1 A | C. L. Stine 5 | R. B. Fisher‡ | Mrs. James Todd 4 C |
| Paris, Tex. | J. Morgan Crook 9 | Mrs. Odous Park 4 | Grady Hudson 4 M | W. F. Hicks 11 M | A. H. Chamness | Carolyn S. Scott 8 |
| Parkersburg, W. Va. | Allen C. Murdock 6 | Myrtle L. Hoffman 13 M | D. B. Leonard 6 M | Leland Merrill 5 M | Walter B. Huffman | Anne E. Taylor |
| Park Ridge, Ill. | William A. McKee 4 | Ian Glass 4 E | Henry L. Blim 4 M | Chas. DeLeuw & Co. 4 C | H. D. Winslow 2 E | Francis Holbrook 2 M |
| Parma, Ohio | Anthony A. Fleger 2 | | Royland Reichert 2 E | Charles Schulz M | M. M. Berry B | |
| Parsons, Kans. | Alfred Coad 4 | Dale M. Raymond 3‡ | Charles Cory 4 M | S. John Rever 2‡ | Rees Hughes 14 B | Belle Curry 26 B |
| Pasadena, Calif.† | E. O. Nay 4 | Bessie Chamberlain 28 A | Harold P. Huls 6 B | Harvey W. Hincks 3 A | John A. Sexson 7 B | Jeannette Drake 16 B |
| Passaic, N. J. | John R. Johnson 4 | Arthur D. Bolton 16 M | Thomas E. Duffy 4 M | Morris Mandl 4‡ | Arthur D. Arnold 2 B | Maud Stull 4 B |
| Paterson, N. J. | John V. Hinchliffe 6 | Edward DuPree 9 M | Salvatore Viviano 4 M | William F. Ward 3 M | John R. Wilson 29 B | Leo R. Etzkorn 4 B |
| Pawtucket, R. I. | John F. Quinn 2 | James F. Kaveny 2 C | John A. O'Neill 2 C | Thomas E. Harding 2 C | Frank A. R. Allen 1 B | Frank Greene 1 C |
| Peabody, Mass. | James E. McVann* | Edward J. Dowd 12 C | E. A. Hershenson* M | Roger W. Macdonald 6 M | William A. Welch 3 B | John E. Keefe 10 B |
| Peekskill, N. Y. | James MacKay 1 | William F. Gallagher 6 C | S. T. Gambino 2 C | Ben F. Smith 4 M | Julius Scott 1 B | Ella F. Fowler 11 |
| Pekin, Ill. | R. L. Russell 4 | Allen R. Farmer 16 M | Walter Cunningham* M | David G. Miller 2 C | C. B. Smith B | Helen Haase B |
| Pensacola, Fla.† | H. Clay Armstrong 3 | J. E. Frenkel 3 A | E. E. Mason 2 C | O. J. Semmes, Jr. 3 A | J. H. Varnum | Lottie G. Flinn |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Peoria, Ill. | Chas. L. O'Brien 2 | William E. Moran 2 E | S. M. Friedlander 2 M | Harold H. Horner 2 M | E. C. Fischer B | E. W. Browning B |
| Perth Amboy, N. J. | Edward J. Patten 1 | Philip P. Costelo 12‡ | H. S. Medinets 8‡ | L. P. Booz‡ | W. C. McGinnis‡ | E. H. Crowell‡ |
| Peru, Ind. | William H. Long 4 | Harry E. Worl 4 E | Hugh Lawrence 4 M | Harrold Norris 4 M | J. P. Crodian | Inez L. Colby |
| Petersburg, Va.† | John R. Jolly 4 | Wm. F. Spotswood 12 C | R. B. Willcox 12 C | Joseph M. Hatchett* A | Henry G. Ellis 11 B | Theresa D. Hodges 11 A |
| Phenix City, Ala. | Ashby Floyd | Joseph S. Bird* E | Roy L. Smith C | | L. P. Stough B | |
| Philadelphia, Pa. | J. Hampton Moore 7 | | D. J. Smyth 3 M | John H. Neeson | Edward C. Broome 10 B | F. H. Price 1 B |
| Phillipsburg, N. J. | John F. O'Donell 1 | Harvey G. Wismer 14 C | S. C. Smith, Jr. 15 C | Harry Mixell 16 C | S. C. Sloan 3 B | Edna Woodroffe 9 B |
| Phoenix, Ariz.† | Joseph S. Jenckes 2 | Joseph C. Furst C | Herman Lewkowitz C | B. M. Atwood A | John D. Loper 26 | Jane Hudgins B |
| Phoenixville, Pa.† | C. M. Mower 1 | John T. Bush 6 C | Fred Deininger 1‡ | Norman G. Young 5 C | Martin L. Peters 6 B | Alta Kriebel |
| Pine Bluff, Ark. | H. I. Holderness | R. E. Lee E | Evan W. Crawford E | H. T. Rudder C | J. R. Allen B | Mrs. C. W. Bishop B |
| Piqua, Ohio† | V. R. Osborn 5 | Cloyd Smith 13 C | B. S. Keyt 9 A | Albert Schroeder 19 A | Geo. C. Dietrich 25 B | Gertrude Irvin 18 B |
| Pittsburg, Kans. | A. L. Cowden 6 | Leonard Boyd 23 C | E. V. Bruce 2 C | H. W. Nesch 2 C | M. M. Rose 8 B | Theresa Randolph 25 B |
| Pittsburgh, Pa. | William N. McNair 1 | Robert Clark 5 C | Ward Bonsall 1 M | U. N. Arthur 25‡ | Ben G. Graham B | Ralph Munn 7 |
| Pittsfield, Mass. | Allen H. Bagg 1 | Harold F. Goggins 6 E | Charles A. Albert 1 M | Arthur B. Farnham 1 M | Edward J. Russell 1 B | Frank A. Henshaw* B |
| Pittston, Pa. | Ambrose Langan 5 | Frank P. Wall 8 C | Wm. H. Gillespie 6 C | R. N. Myers 14 C | D. J. Cray | Sarah A. Mason |
| Plainfield, N. J. | M. B. Stutsman 2 | Fred Toegel 1 C | William Newcorn 3 M | H. Edwin Bush 1 M | F. W. Cook B | Florence Bowman B |
| Plattsburg, N. Y. | Leander A. Bouyea 3 | W. J. Arbenger 7 M | Harry P. Kehoe 3 M | Ralph L. Signor 20 | Geo. M. Elmendorf 14 B | Helen E. Hale 10 B |
| Pleasantville, N. J. | Charles E. Jackson | | | R. P. Thompson | Simon M. Horstick 9 | Mrs. B. H. Wilson |
| Plymouth, Mass. | James A. White | | | Arthur E. Blackmer | Anson B. Handy 9 | Charlotte Haskins 2 |
| Plymouth, Pa. | C. W. Honeywell 1 | George Trebilcox 5 C | Thomas M. Lewis‡ | A. Kostenbauder‡ | Henry S. Jones‡ | |
| Pocatello, Idaho | Charles A. Brown 2 | J. Ward Green 2 M | Ralph H. Jones 4 M | R. F. Hamilton 2 M | E. N. Vaughn 3 B | Edna Jarboe 6 B |
| Pomona, Calif. | C. C. Perrin 2 | H. A. Leigh 6 E | Charles R. Stead 2 E | F. C. Froehde 15 C | Emmett Clark 8 B | Sarah Jacobus 25 B |
| Ponca City, Okla. | T. W. Prentice 2 | C. E. Norton 15 C | R. O. Wilson 3 C | E. A. Jones 1 C | W. W. Isle | Gertrude K. Sterba 7 C |
| Pontiac, Mich.† | Frank Ruf 1 | Harry Maurer 14 C | W. A. Ewart 3 C | L. M. Wrenn 3 A | William Harris 16 B | Adah Shelly 11 A |
| Port Angeles, Wash. | R. E. Davis 3 | N. M. Hawkins 3‡ | F. L. Plummer M | H. E. Dodge 1‡ | H. G. Hanbloom | Jennilee Norris 6 B |
| Port Arthur, Tex.† | E. R. Winstel 1 | A. F. Hine 2 C | V. J. Wistner 3 C | H. H. Poole 2 A | G. M. Simms 12 B | Francis Carter* B |
| Port Chester, N. Y. | William B. Banister 2 | Edward F. Burnes 3 C | Oliver K. King 1 C | Francis I. McGrath 5 C | Evans E. Jones 1 B | Clara Merritt 10 B |
| Port Huron, Mich. | George L. Harvey 1 | E. C. Fitzpatrick 13 C | P. H. Kane 5 C | Earl Whitmore 6 C | L. A. Packard 7 B | Leila Wilcox B |
| Port Jervis, N. Y. | Wendell Phillips 3 | John F. Cleary 33 C | Wm. A. Parshall 9 C | Fredrick X. Conrad 6 C | Arthur H. Naylor B | Leora E. Dugar 8 |
| Portland, Me.† | | A. Edwin Smith 11 C | Harry C. Wilbur 15 C | Edward M. Hunt 19 A | William B. Jack 14 B | Jane L. Burbank 10 |
| Portland, Ore. | Joseph K. Carson 2 | | Frank S. Grant 13 C | L. G. Apperson 1 C | Charles A. Rice | Anne Mulheron 15 |
| Portsmouth, N. H. | Robert Marvin 1 | Peter J. Hickey 1 C | John L. Mitchell 4 C | Harold Woods* B | Harry L. Moore 9 B | Hannah G. Fernald 27 B |
| Portsmouth, Ohio† | Joseph L. Kountz 1 | Evangeline Justice 5 C | Walter Dickey 5 C | Charles S. Stevenson A | Frank Apel 2 B | Mrs. Frank Moulton B |
| Portsmouth, Va.† | Vernon A. Brooks 1 | L. C. Brinson 17 C | R. C. Barclay 13 C | Joseph F. Weaver 25 A | H. A. Hunt 23‡ | Esther M. Wilson |
| Pottstown, Pa. | Jesse R. Evans 1 | M. L. Seasholtz 15 C | Carroll L. Rutter 3 C | R. E. Shaner 20 C | F. M. Haiston 1 B | Freda E. Gloss |
| Pottsville, Pa. | C. A. Lord 1 | G. A. Berner 44‡ | R. A. Freiler 3‡ | George H. Steidel 6‡ | L. A. BuDahn 4‡ | Edith Patterson‡ |
| Poughkeepsie, N. Y. | Geo. V. L. Spratt 2 | Robert F. Jones 2 M | Paul A. Rieser 2 M | Thomas F. Lawlor 16‡ | Ward C. Moon 16 B | Mary Corliss 7 B |
| Providence, R. I. | James E. Dunne 8 | Raymond P. McElroy 4 C | John C. Mahoney 4 C | S. Frank Nolan 4‡ | A. J. Stoddard B | C. E. Sherman 5 |
| Provo, Utah | O. A. Smoot 2 | Fred Evans 16 M | Raymond Holbrook 2 M | Earl Conder 2‡ | H. A. Dixon 4 E | Maline Sumner 1 B |
| Pueblo, Colo. | J. W. Carpenter 9 | George W. Clark 5 C | John T. Barbrick 1 C | D. P. Gaymon‡ | James H. Risley 14 B | M. L. Strang B |
| Quincy, Ill. | Leo W. Lenane 2 | Duke Schroer 25 E | John T. Reardon 2‡ | B. W. Bartlett 2 M | W. E. Nelson 2 B | M. Ringier 43 B |
| Quincy, Mass. | Charles A. Ross 2 | Emery L. Crane 23 E | Charles R. Young 2 M | Wallace S. Carson 8 M | James N. Muir 8 B | Galen W. Hill 9 |
| Racine, Wis. | Wm. J. Swoboda 4 | Frank J. Becker 12 M | C. C. Colbert 5 M | James Beaugrand 13 M | W. C. Giese 2 B | Miss L. Hunt 8 B |
| Rahway, N. J. | John E. Barger* | W. L. Baldwin 1 C | William V. Herer 1 C | Levi Price 1 C | Arthur Perry 5 B | Ruth L. Peters 5 |

## Table VIII-A.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Mayor (All elected) | City Clerk | City Attorney | City Engineer | Superintendent of Schools | City Librarian |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Raleigh, N. C. | George A. Iseley 4 | J. E. Sawyer 8‡ | J. M. Broughton 2‡ | Roy L. Williamson 10‡ | P. S. Daniels 8‡ | Mrs. J. S. Atkinson 8 |
| Rapid City, S. D.† | C. L. Doherty* | C. I. Leedy 7 C | Boyd Leedom 1 C | (Vacant) | E. B. Bergquist 6 B | Marjorie Smith 16 B |
| Reading, Pa. | Heber Ermentrout 3 | J. A. Glassmoyer 14 C | J. W. Speicher 3 C | E. C. Weber 10 C | Thomas H. Ford 1 B | Alfred D. Keator 6 B |
| Red Bank, N. J. | Charles R. English 4 | Amy E. Shinn 12 M | J. S. Applegate 8 M | George K. Allen 18 M | Edwin C. Gilland 20B | H. Gertrude Capen 15 B |
| Redlands, Calif. | W. L. Fowler 3 | C. P. Hook 21 E | W. J. Hartzell 10 C | George S. Hinckley 27 C | H. G. Clement | Mabel Inness 10 B |
| Reno, Nev. | Sam Frank 1 | J. B. Reese E | LeRoy F. Pike E | James M. Glynn M | B. D. Billinghurst B | H. W. Miles B |
| Rensselaer, N. Y. | James Johnstone 3 | H. C. Younghans 2 E | LaVerne Orvis 3 M | John Quinn 3 M | Walter S. Clark 18 B | Alice Ashton |
| Revere, Mass. | James M. O'Brien* | Albert J. Brown 30 E | Wendell P. Murray 10 M | James A. Lockhart | Carl F. Lindstol 7 C | Nina Cross 7 B |
| Richmond, Calif.† | George F. Imbach* | A. C. Faris 22 C | T. M. Carlson 9 C | E. A. Hoffman 11 A | W. T. Helms 33 B | Norah McNeill 17 B |
| Richmond, Ind. | Joseph M. Waltermann* | Harold D. Salter* E | William H. Kelley, Jr.* M | Simeon W. Hodgin 5 M | W. G. Bate B | Ada L. Bernhardt |
| Richmond, Va. | J. Fulmer Bright 10 | E. S. Bolen* C | James E. Cannon 12 C | R. Keith Compton | Jesse H. Binford 2 B | Thomas P. Ayer B |
| Ridgefield Park, N. J. | Arthur W. Kneerim 3 | Elwood G. Hoyt 12 C | (Law Firm) C | David C. Boswell C | A. Ray Palmer B | Muriel Kern B |
| Ridgewood, N. J. | James S. Anderson 4 | Wilbur Morris 23 C | T. L. Zimmerman, Jr. 4C | Roland A. Hartom 8 C | Irwin B. Somerville 3 B | Elizabeth Butcher 9 B |
| River Rouge, Mich. | Arthur L. Valade 2 | Raymond J. Peters 16 E | T. Roy Finn 2 M | Mason L. Brown 12 M | Alex MacDonald 26 B | Jane O. Hartfig 4 B |
| Riverside, Calif. | Eugene B. Criddle 2 | G. Albert Mills 9 E | Eugene Best 5 M | James R. Elliott 2 M | Ira C. Landis 7 B | Charles F. Woods 12 B |
| Roanoke, Va.† | Sidney F. Small* | L. D. James* C | R. C. Jackson 16 C | C. L. Watkins 12 A | D. E. McGuilkin 17 B | Pearl Hinsley B |
| Rochester, Minn. | Julius J. Reiter 10 | A. F. Wright 20 C | James T. Spillane 12 C | Chas. H. Armstrong 22 C | George H. Sanberg 10 B | Grace M. Stevens 5 B |
| Rochester, N. H. | Sumner W. Watson 2 | Frank E. Hussey 24 C | Guy Smart 9 C |  | A. S. Rollins 2 C | Lillian Parshley 40 B |
| Rochester, N. Y.† | Charles Stanton 1 | Thomas P. O'Leary 7 C | Harold P. Burke 1 A | Morgan D. Hayes 1‡ | James M. Spinning 1 B | John A. Lowe 3 B |
| Rockford, Ill. | C. Henry Bloom 2 | Elmer O. Strand 14 E | A. O. Ahlstrand 2 M | Raymond A. Orput 2 M | Frank Jensen 12 B | Jane Hubbell 25 B |
| Rock Hill, S. C.† | David Lyle 1 | B. R. Neely 2 C | Spencer & White 15 C | Millin & White | R. C. Burts 19 B | Louise McMasters 3 B |
| Rock Island, Ill. | John W. Graham 1 | Martin T. Rudgren 28 E | F. A. Math 1 M | Wallace Treichler 38 M | Justin A. Washburn E | Ellen Gale 58 B |
| Rockville Centre, N. Y. | Horace L. Allen 4 | George S. Utter 26 C | Francis G. Hooley 26 C | Edwin S. Voorhis | Floyd B. Watson 2 | Alice H. Decker 5 |
| Rocky Mount, N. C.† | M. D. Munn 2 | L. B. Aycock 10 C | W. L. Thorp 7 C | C. E. Exum 4 A | R. M. Wilson 15 B | Nell G. Battle 10 B |
| Rome, Ga.† | A. P. McKay 2 | E. L. Cantrell 2 A | W. B. Mebane 2 A | O. M. Lanham 2 | B. F. Quigg 15 C | Helen Eastman 23 C |
| Rome, N. Y. | Arthur C. Tedd 5 | James A. Doyle, Jr. 5 E | John P. Gualtieri 1 M | John J. Gawkins 12 B | George R. Staley 22 B | Helen Salzmann 11 |
| Roselle, N. J. | Francis V. Lowden 3 | Jacob F. Ostrander 27 | Guy W. Gordon 3 M | John L. Miller 3 M | John R. Patterson 6 B | R. E. Lillibridge 17 M |
| Roswell, N. Mex.† | J. E. Moore 1 | Joe Dekker 1 M | Howard Buchley 6 M | Lea Rowland 16 M | D. N. Pope 20 B | Mrs. T. E. Whitney 10 B |
| Royal Oak, Mich.† | H. Lloyd Clawson 5 | R. Bruce Fleming 13 C | W. C. Hudson 9 C | E. J. Giffels 9 A | N. J. Quickstad 3 B | Elizabeth Briggs 18 B |
| Rutherford, N. J. | John DeGroot 1 | H. J. Landshof* M | O. T. Somerville* M | R. B. Brown 1 M | C. A. Fetterly | Dorothy Burrows |
| Rutland, Vt. | Arthur W. Perkins 8 | H. B. Whittier 42 M | Milford K. Smith 2 M | Edward L. Tracy 3 M | W. W. Fairchild 14 B | Cynthia M. Gorton‡ |
| Sacramento, Calif.† | Arthur D. Ferguson 1 | H. G. Denton 11 C | Hugh B. Bradford 7 C | Fred J. Klaus 5 A | Charles C. Hughes 24 B | Grace Taylor 3 A |
| Saginaw, Mich. | Robert C. Weber 4 | Shirley W. Corrigan C | David McLaughlin C | Herman Eymer 23 C | Chester F. Miller B | Beatrice Prall 9 |
| St. Augustine, Fla.† | Walter B. Fraser 1 | Charles E. Kettle 5 C | E. N. Calhoun 24 C | J. L. Center 15 A | D. D. Corbett 2 E | J. E. Davison 7‡ |
| St. Charles, Mo. | Wayne S. O'Neal 4 | Clarence G. Wessler 2 C | Claude S. Tuttle 4 E | H. D. Smelser 10 C | S. Blackhurst 8 E | K. M. Linneman 5 B |
| St. Cloud, Minn. | Phil Collignon 3 | Grace M. Atkinson 7 C | Allen A. Atwood 2 C | R. E. Borrowman 7 C | M. J. Weinberger | Alma E. Penrose 8 B |
| St. Joseph, Mo. | John Schuder 5 | Royce V. Creek 2 C | John Boyer 2 M | H. D. Judson 5 B | I. E. Stutsman 1 B | Irving R. Bundy 10 B |
| St. Louis, Mo. | B. F. Dickmann 2 | Michael J. Cullinane 2 M | Charles M. Hay 2 M | Baxter L. Brown | Henry C. Gerling 5 B | Arthur W. Bostwick 25 B |
| St. Paul, Minn. | Mark H. Gehan 1 | L. R. S. Ferguson 1 C | John Connelly 1 C | G. M. Shepard 3‡ | S. O. Hartwell 10‡ | J. T. Jennings 5‡ |
| St. Petersburg, Fla.† | R. G. Blanc 2 | Frank Wilson 4 C | W. F. Way 2 C | Frank O. Lee 3 A | George M. Lynch | Mary Bright 11‡ |
| Salem, Mass. | George J. Bates 10 | John J. Connelly 9 C | James Kinsella 1 M | Frank P. Morse 7 M | George R. Bemis 14 B | Rolfe P. Emerson 3 B |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Salem, Ohio | Norman Phillips 2 | T. A. Eckstein 6 C | Lozier Caplan 2 E | F. S. Parckhoff 8 C | E. S. Kerr 4 B | Alice Gladdon 7 B |
| Salem, Ore. | V. E. Kuhn | A. Warren Jones E | Chris Kowitz C | Hugh A. Rogers C | S. Gaiser B | Maude Covington B |
| Salina, Kans.† | R. J. Pafford 1 | Charles E. Banker 24 A | W. S. Norris 10 A | H. N. Lamme 4 A | W. S. Heusner 20 B | Delia Brown 30 B |
| Salinas, Calif. | V. J. Barlogio 3 | F. E. Heple 2 C | Russell Scott 4 C | Donald Davies, Jr. 4 C | R. D. Case | Amanda Anderson 2 C |
| Salisbury, Md. | E. Shelton Jones 2 | J. R. Laws 4 M | A. E. Williams 5 M | Clark Gardiner 2 M | James M. Bennett 10 | Mrs. S. K. White |
| Salisbury, N. C.† | H. W. Davis 2 | Elizabeth Massey 4 C | J. W. Ellis 4 C | J. A. English 2 C | J. H. Knox 1 B | Adelaide Bennett |
| Salt Lake City, Utah | Louis Marcus 3 | Ethel Macdonald 15 M | Fisher Harris 3 M | W. D. Beers 3‡ | L. John Nuttal, Jr. 3 | Joanna H. Sprague 38 |
| San Angelo, Tex.† | J. L. Tweedy 1 | Mamie Barfield 21 A | Robert Hughes 7 A | J. P. Burden 9 A | Felix Smith 17 B | Doris P. Wood 7 |
| San Antonio, Tex. | C. K. Quin 2 | James Simpson 5 M | T. D. Cobbs, Jr. 5 M | I. Ewig 11‡ | J. C. Cochran 4 B | Julia Grothaus 2 B |
| San Benito, Tex. | E. L. Barmore 3 | L. E. Stanley 7 M | A. L. Montgomery 10 M | Bruce Gentry | O. L. Davis 1 B | |
| San Bernardino, Calif. | Ormond W. Seccombe 2 | John H. Osborn 20 E | William Guthrie 4 E | Gordon Stewart 2 M | Lewis E. Adams 5 B | May Coddington 22‡ |
| San Diego, Calif.† | R. B. Irones* | Allen H. Wright 24 C | C. L. Byers 4 E | H. W. Jorgensen 7 A | Will C. Crawford 1 B | Cornelia Plaister 9 A |
| Sandusky, Ohio† | George J. Schade 1 | Beatrice Snyder 15 C | C. E. Moyer 5 C | E. E. Hartung 1 A | Frank J. Prout 13 B | M. Keefe 15 B |
| Sanford, Fla.† | T. L. Dumas 1 | F. S. Lamson 7 C | Fred R. Wilson 6 C | Fred T. Williams | T. W. Lawton 18 E | Mrs. E. J. Moughton 3 C |
| San Francisco, Calif. | Angelo J. Rossi 4 | J. S. Dunnigan 23 C | John J. O'Toole 9 E | J. J. Casey 3‡ | Edwin A. Lee 1 B | Robert Rea 45 B |
| San Jose, Calif.† | Charles Bishop 7 | John J. Lynch 15 C | Archer Bowden 15 A | W. L. Popp 14 A | W. L. Bachrodt 13 B | Edith Daley 12 B |
| San Leandro, Calif.† | Earl Derry | E. F. Hutchins E | A. L. Poe C | J. C. Thayer A | W. O. Davies B | Mary Brown B |
| San Mateo, Calif.† | A. R. Cotton 4 | E. W. Foster 16 E | E. A. Wilson 3 C | E. P. Wilsey 5 C | George W. Hall | Inez M. Crawford 23 B |
| Santa Ana, Calif. | E. G. Warner 4 | E. L. Vegely 16 E | Clyde C. Downing 4 E | J. L. McBride 2 C | Frank Henderson 4 B | Jeanette McFadden 30 B |
| Santa Barbara, Calif. | H. T. Nielson 4 | George D. Geib 5 M | J. F. Goux 6 E | E. B. Brown 8 M | Curtis E. Warren 1 | Frances B. Linn 29 B |
| Santa Cruz, Calif. | Roy Hammond 2 | S. A. Evans 24 C | Francis R. Hall 3 M | R. W. Fowler 8 C | C. R. Holbrook 5 | Minerva Waterman 35 B |
| Santa Fe, N. Mex. | Charles B. Barker 2 | W. J. Rounseville 3 C | Earl Kenny 2 C | W. G. Turley 3 C | Isabel L. Eckles | Salome E. Anthony 3 |
| Santa Monica, Calif. | William H. Carter 3 | R. A. Krueger 1‡ | Boyd C. Barrington 1 C | Howard B. Carter 12 C | P. R. Davis 3 B | Elfie Mosse 40 C |
| Santa Rosa, Calif.† | Geo. R. Caden 6 | Ney L. Donovan 8 M | Carl Barnard 4 M | Arthur P. Noyes 10 A | Jerome Cross B | Ruth Hall B |
| Sapulpa, Okla.† | F. M. Horn* | A. H. Chapman 4 A | Eugene B. Smith 3 C | | E. O. Shaw 1 | Mrs. O. C. Clark 5 B |
| Saratoga Springs, N. Y. | H. Schrade, Jr. 3 | Charles Lynch 1 E | R. J. Sherman 3 M | S. J. Mott 20 C | H. Crandall B | |
| Saugus, Mass. | George Quamby | Walter A. Wilson 1 | George Mason | | Vernon Evans | Laura H. Taylor |
| Sault St. Marie, Mich.† | Geo. J. Laundy 1 | Mark Sheply 8 C | A. E. Sharpe 8 C | Ralph E. Speer 12 A | G. G. Malcolm 15 B | Alice Clapp 15 B |
| Savannah, Ga. | Thomas Gamble 2 | J. F. Sullivan 4 M | Shelby Myrick 2 M | A. S. Goebel 2 M | Ormond B. Strong 9 | Ola M. Wyeth 15 B |
| Schenectady, N. Y.† | Henry C. Fagal 5 | Simon Etkin 1 C | William D. Smith 1 M | LeRoy C. Purdy 1 M | W. H. Pillsbury 6 B | Henry Glen 35 B |
| Scranton, Pa. | Stanley J. Davis 1 | William P. Huester 15 C | Jerome Myers 1 M | Charles F. Schroeder 9 M | John H. Dyer 6 B | Harold A. Wooster 5 B |
| Seattle, Wash. | Charles L. Smith 1 | H. W. Carroll 27 E | A. C. VanSoelen 5 E | Thomas R. Beeman 1 M | Worth McClure 5 B | Judson T. Jennings 28 B |
| Sedalia, Mo. | O. B. Poundstone 1 | P. J. Metcalf* M | Frank Armstrong 1 E | James I. Collins* M | Heber U. Hunt B | Grace M. Young B |
| Selma, Ala. | L. P. Burns 2 | R. M. Watters 9 C | W. E. Brown* C | | P. M. Munro 5 B | Bettie Keith |
| Seminole, Okla. | J. N. Harber | | | R. N. Geer | John G. Mitchell | Esther J. Sheets |
| Shaker Heights, Ohio | William J. Van Aken 20 | E. P. Rudolph 11 M | Ralph W. Jones 4 M | Fred A. Pease M | Fred H. Bair 6 B | |
| Shamokin, Pa. | A. G. Shissler 9 | John C. Waxy* C | D. W. Kearney* C | Leon C. Adams 1 C | Paul Witmeyer 2 B | |
| Sharon, Pa. | J. Fred Thomas 3 | Fred S. Williams 12 C | Fred T. Fruit 14 C | L. E. Burnside 14 C | W. G. Gamble B | Eleanor Carver 12 B |
| Shawnee, Okla.† | Phillip A. Watson 2 | J. C. Coleman 9 A | Randall S. Pitman 2 C | E. F. Edge 2 A | A. S. Burke 15 B | Mrs. R. W. Funk 25 B |
| Sheboygan, Wis. | Willard Sonnenburg 2 | Erwin Mohr 9 E | Arthur H. Gruhle 6 E | Arthur L. Boley 6 M | Henry E. Smith 1 B | Bertha Marx 32 B |
| Shelby, N. C. | S. A. McMurry 6 | Miss Reeves Forney 3 M | D. Z. Newton 6 C | [illegible] | B. L. Smith 5 B | Mrs. Grover Beam 2‡ |
| Shelbyville, Ind. | L. E. Webb 5 | Lulu Porterfield 2‡ | Ralph Adams* M | Clyde R. Yater 5 M | W. F. Loper | Bertha Bowlby |
| Shelton, Conn. | Frank V. Crofut | J. Stirling Edwards | John J. O'Connell M | Vincent V. Clarke C | Harry E. Fowler 25 B | Jessamine Ward B |
| Shenandoah, Pa. | Joseph T. Sepauley | A. F. Schlitzer | Luther B. Edwards | Geo. Mozdyniewicz | A. J. Ratchford 8 | M. Helen Danks |
| Sherman, Tex.† | H. G. Tuck 4 | J. A. Henderson 13 C | Geo. L. Hamilton 3 A | B. A. Crocker 1 A | L. T. Cook 5 B | Dorothy Montgomery 1 B |
| Shorewood, Wis.† | Clarence E. Torrey 3 | John L. Jones 3 E | H. O. Wolfe 2 A | Harry A. Schmitt 10 B | H. S. Hemenway 10 B | Floyd Hansen 8 A |

## Table VIII-A.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Mayor (All elected) | City Clerk | City Attorney | City Engineer | Superintendent of Schools | City Librarian |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Shreveport, La. | Sam S. Caldwell 1 | M. Turner 5 C | Jos. H. Jackson 1 C | H. E. Barnes 18 C | E. W. Jones | Lois W. Henderson 12 M |
| Sioux City, Iowa | W. D. Hayes 5 | E. V. Moone 5 M | H. C. Harper 3 M | L. N. Hintgen 10 C | L. W. Feik 4 | Mildred Pike 8 B |
| Sioux Falls, S. D. | A. N. Graff 1 |  | Hugh S. Gamble 1 M | R. E. Bragstad 11 C | A. A. McDonald 28 B | Alberta Caille 15 B |
| Somerville, Mass. | James E. Hagan 1 | Norman E. Corwin 9 | C. J. Muldoon 1 M | James E. Mullaney 1 M | Everett W. Ireland 7 B | George H. Evans 18 B |
| South Bend, Ind. | Geo. W. Freyermuth 4 | Mary B. L. Taylor 4 E | Edwin W. Hunter 4 M | Fred G. Anderson 4 M | Frank Allen 3 B | Ethel Baker B |
| Southbridge, Mass. |  |  |  | George R. Tasse | Fuller L. Austin 1 | Ella E. Miersch |
| South Gate, Calif. | Harold E. Pomeroy 3 | H. C. Peiffer 8 E | Clyde Woodworth 5 C | Guy F. Nevill 3 C |  | Helen Norton |
| South Milwaukee, Wis. | Charles Plotz 2 | H. W. Daehling 2 E | C. J. O'Brien 2 E | J. Stosick C | J. P. Mann B | Barbara Olson B |
| South Orange, N. J. | Dudley W. Figgis 2 | M. A. Fitzsimmons 32 | T. E. Fitzsimmons 3 B | Arthur Domaratius 1 | John Bosshart 10 B | Mrs. Harris 4 B |
| South Pasadena, Calif.† | J. C. Jacols* | Nettie A. Hewitt 14 E | H. E. Vedder 10 C | Frank H. Clough 8 C | George C. Bush 27 | Georgia A. Diehl 4 C |
| South Portland, Me.† | Charles F. Waterman 1 | H. A. Brinkerhoff 2 C | Milan J. Smith A | Albert W. Waterman A | Leroy C. Day B |  |
| South River, N. J. | John J. Quinn 1 | John R. Petrie 15 M | George L. Burton 10 M | E. B. VanNess 12 M | William Lesh 15 B | S. T. M. Brown 6 B |
| South St. Paul, Minn. | S. W. Dennison 2 | E. L. Sloan 2 E | Ralph R. Barry* C | W. H. Cropsey 2 C | I. T. Simley 1 B | Grace Dorival 1 B |
| Spartanburg, S. C. | Ben Hill Brown 12 | T. K. Fletcher 5 C | L. A. Odom 2 C |  | L. W. Jenkins 1 B | Mary J. Baugham 20 B |
| Spokane, Wash. | Leonard Fund 6 | O. A. Dirkes 10 C | George M. Ferris 2 C | A. D. Butler 17 C | Orville C. Pratt B | George W. Fuller 24 B |
| Springfield, Ill. | John W. Kapp, Jr. 4 | Marie M. Smith 16‡ | Hugh J. Dobbs 4 M | Morgan P. O'Brien 4 B | Frank Vasey 4 B | Martha Wilson 20 B |
| Springfield, Mass. | Henry Martens 1 | Clifford Smith 13 E | Donald M. Macaulay 1 M | C. W. Phillips 2 C | John E. Granrud 2 B | Hiller C. Wellman 33 |
| Springfield, Mo. | Harry D. Durst 3 | F. E. Rosback 3 C | K. W. Patterson 1 M | J. W. Hendrickson 4‡ | H. P. Study 5 B | Harriet M. Horine 21 B |
| Springfield, Ohio† | Fred R. Gray 1 | R. L. McIntire 1 C | M. E. Spencer 12 C | William E. Lucas 1 A | F. M. Shelton 12 B | G. Winterrowd 5 |
| Stamford, Conn. | A. N. Phillips, Jr. 5 |  | Maurice J. Buckley 1 M | W. S. Conlon | Leon C. Staples 2 B | Alice M. Colt 28 |
| Statesville, N. C. | E. R. Rankin 4 | H. H. Yount 2 C | J. R. McLaughlin 2 C | R. L. Crawley 2 C | R. M. Gray 15 B | Mrs. D. S. Conway 3 B |
| Staunton, Va.† | William A. Grubert 1 | Miss C. V. Herndon 4 A | Peyton Cochran 13 C | J. C. Ruff 1 C | L. F. Shelburne 10 | Mrs. O. L. Denton 1 B |
| Steelton, Pa. | James J. Coleman 1 | Charles E. Newbaker 2 C | J. Paul Rupp 5 C | J. P. Croll | Charles S. Davis 17 B |  |
| Sterling, Ill. | H. E. Burkholder 7 | Andrew Huber 8‡ | Edward F. Mee 8 M | A. G. Hubbard 20 M | O. A. Fackler 12 B | Caroline Brucker 4 B |
| Steubenville, Ohio | James C. McMaster 3 | J. A. Cartledge 9 E | Carl A. Weinman 3 E | James K. McGinnis 20 M | Russell H. Erwine 2 B | E. J. Neidengard 25 B |
| Stevens Point, Wis.† |  | Eleanore Glodoske 3 A | L. N. Jenkins 10 A | M. D. Jackson 5 A | P. M. Vincent 12 B | Aileen E. MacGeorge 4 A |
| Stockton, Calif.† | Con. J. Franke 3 | B. L. Trahern 4 C | Tom B. Quinn* C | Lyle Payton 6 A | Ansel S. Williams | Ida E. Condit 9 A |
| Stoneham, Mass. |  | Charles A. Owen 10 E | Luther Hill 5 C |  | Charles E. Varney 6 B | Martha A. Jackson 13 |
| Stratford, Conn.† |  | Wm. H. Wilcoxson 1 C | Pullman & Comley 10 C | Walter B. Dunbar 3 A | E. Ward Ireland 7 B | Frances B. Russell 16 |
| Streator, Ill. | George P. Elias 4 | Fred J. Hart 4 M | Frank J. Harrison 2 M | Fred H. Renz 22 M | H. K. Whittier 2 B | Alice E. Arthur B |
| Struthers, Ohio | T. A. Roberts 7 |  | W. O. R. Johnson 5 E | Albert Haeney 6 M | H. E. Zuber 1 B |  |
| Suffolk, Va.† | O. S. Smith, Jr. 8 | Chas. L. Hutchins 15 C | John K. Hutton 1 C | J. C. Causey, Jr. 3 A | John E. Martin 18 B | Mrs. S. M. Lawrence |
| Summit, N. J. | E. T. Snook 2 | F. C. Kentz 22 E | F. C. Kentz 3 C | F. A. Murray 23 C | John B. Dougall 11 B | Emilie Hill 20 B |
| Sumter, S. C.† | F. B. Creech 6 | S. K. Rowland 1 C | S. K. Nash 8 C | Joseph Palmer | S. H. Edmunds 30 B | Mrs. T. C. Reed 12‡ |
| Sunbury, Pa. | M. R. Michaels 1 | Mary E. Holsapple 10 C | W. J. B. Bloom 5 C | G. F. Keefer 14 C | C. C. Maderia 1 B | Miriam Peters |
| Superior, Wis. | Fred A. Baxter 13 | E. R. Bowser 2 M | James J. Conroy 2 M | Dean B. Ekstrom 1 M | W. R. Davies 4 B | Martha Merrell 2 B |
| Swampscott, Mass. |  | Ralph D. Merritt 12 E | Edwin J. Coughlin 1 C | Wallace W. Pratt 22 C | Frank L. Mansur 4 B | Lucy I. Eveleth 15 B |
| Sweetwater, Tex.† | L. L. Armor 1 | W. H. Whaley 4 C | Carl M. Anderson 4 C | S. H. Bothwell 7 C | B. H. McLain | Mrs. L. C. Vinson 7 A |
| Swissvale, Pa. | D. J. Madigan 1 | Benj. B. Caldwell 3 C | R. L. McDonald 8 C | Alex Hutchinson 10 C | C. S. Bailey 1 B | Juliette Campbell 4 |
| Syracuse, N. Y. | Rolland B. Marvin 6 | Thos. E. Kennedy 20 C | James C. Tormey M | William W. Cronin 6 M | G. Carl Alverson 7 | Paul M. Paine 20 B |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tacoma, Wash. | George A. Smitley 1 | Genevieve Martin 12 C | Harold Carothers 1 C | C. D. Forsbeck 3‡ | E. L. Breckner 3 B | Jacqueline Noel 10 B |
| Tallahassee, Fla.† | John L. Fain 3 | B. H. Bridges 24 C | Guyte P. McCord 8 C | Miller Walston 9 A | F. S. Hartsfield 18 | |
| Tamaqua, Pa. | P. J. Barton 5 | Henry Keilman 20 C | B. J. Duffy 3 C | Luther Hartung 2 C | F. G. Horner 9 B | Kathryn Schaeffer 1 B |
| Tampa, Fla. | R. E. L. Chancey 3 | P. R. Bourquardez 3 E | A. B. McMullen 2 M | Roy H. Cason 5 M | Milton Carruthers 1 B | Helen V. Stelle 17 B |
| Taunton, Mass. | Andrew J. McGraw 2 | Edwin A. Tetlow 3 E | John E. Welch 2 M | A. K. Crowell 3 C | W. A. Morey E | Maybelle Murphy‡ |
| Taylor, Pa. | John A. Evans 4 | E. T. Daniels 3 C | Walter W. Kohler 6 C | Warren Zumbach 4 C | William J. Powell 1 B | Cathryn D. Murphy |
| Temple, Tex.† | W. S. Sealy 1 | W. B. Hoyle 3 C | Winbourne Pearce 1 C | | L. C. Procter 15 B | Mrs. C. H. Black 2‡ |
| Terre Haute, Ind. | Sam. E. Beecher 1 | A. G. Duddleston 1 E | Otis Cook 1‡ | W. Robert Paige 1 | George C. Carroll 8 B | Florence Crawford 8 B |
| Texarkana, Ark. | E. C. Seibert 2 | G. E. Vinson 2 E | Willis B. Smith 2 E | Paul R. Booker | P. N. Bragg B | Georgia Clark B |
| Texarkana, Tex. | William V. Brown 1 | G. D. Garrett 3 E | Ed. B. Levee, Jr. 2 E | M. L. Watson 2 C | H. W. Stilwell 15 B | Georgia H. Clark 4 |
| Thomasville, Ga. | B. S. Inman* | C. C. Pittman 10 E | P. C. Andrews 10 C | | B. B. Broughton 15 B | Fannie Evans 5 B |
| Thomasville, N. C.† | James E. Lambeth 6 | B. H. Harris 17 C | H. R. Kyser 15 C | | J. N. Hauss B | Clara Johnson |
| Tiffin, Ohio | F. W. Kennedy 2 | Albert J. Hafley 2 C | F. A. Hinchey 2 E | C. J. Peters M | Paul V. Brown B | Jessie Hersheiser‡ |
| Toledo, Ohio† | Solon T. Klotz 1 | L. W. Davis 1 C | Ralph W. Doty 1 M | Fred L. Kuebler 1 M | R. Dougdale 1 B | Carl Vitz 13 |
| Tonawanda, N. Y. | Chris S. Warren 2 | Moss W. Simson 25 C | Roland Baxter 16 E | Benjamin Hinkey 5 C | Ralph Mosher 1 B | Katharine M. Kohler |
| Topeka, Kans. | Omar B. Ketchum 4 | F. W. Knapp 8‡ | Randall Harvey* M | H. H. Staley*‡ | A. J. Stout 16 B | Julia McCarthy 1 B |
| Torrington, Conn. | Ernest E. Novey 6 | A. W. Telesca 2 E | Thomas F. Wall‡ | John Smith‡ | George J. Vogel‡ | Katherine W. Sanford |
| Traverse City, Mich. | Mose O. Champney* | O. C. Moffatt 16 C | C. H. Menmuir* C | C. E. Sawyer, Jr. 10 C | Lars Hockstad 2 B | Alice Wait 20 B |
| Trenton, N. J. | George B. LaBarre 2 | John L. Haney 3 M | R. M. Rimo 10‡ | Joseph E. English 10‡ | Paul Loser 3 B | H. L. Hughes 20 B |
| Trinidad, Colo. | David M. Ralston 2 | James Ingles 4 E | John J. Hendrick 2‡ | Hal Barnes 2‡ | | Ruth Justin*‡ |
| Troy, N. Y. | C. F. Burns 15 | Philip A. Murphy 7 C | F. S. Parmenter 2 M | Charles F. Crowley* M | George H. Krug 4 B | Fanny C. Howe 9 |
| Tucson, Ariz.† | Henry O. Jaastad 2 | Charles C. Irvin 4 M | B. G. Thompson* M | Paul E. Fernald 4 A | C. E. Rose 15 B | Mary Breathitt 17 B |
| Tulsa, Okla. | T. A. Penney | Milton W. Davis E | H. O. Bland M | M. C. Shibley M | Will French 1 | Alma R. McGlenn B |
| Turtle Creek, Pa. | W. R. Cunningham 3 | E. E. Little 10 C | B. H. Kenyon | H. S. Harrop | W. A. Rodgers | Katherine Allison |
| Tuscaloosa, Ala. | Luther Davis 12 | H. M. McLeod 4 C | S. H. Sprott 22 C | A. C. Parker 4 C | J. M. Burnett 15 B | Lucy Pou 7 B |
| Two Rivers, Wis.† | Wm. R. Kahlenberg 1 | John P. Hoffman, Jr. 7 A | Fred W. Dicke 38 A | Jack D. Markham 1 A | Fred G. Bishop 17 B | Mrs. B. H. Knight 10 A |
| Tyler, Tex.† | D. H. Rankin 1 | Guy V. McNallie 3 A | Troy Smith 12 A | J. P. Ferrill 10 A | J. M. Hodges 9 B | Elizabeth Haynes 7 B |
| Union City, N. J. | Lewis B. Eastmead 5 | W. G. Turner 5 C | James C. Agnew 5‡ | Ord J. Darling 4‡ | A. O. Smith B | Paul M. Konert‡ |
| Uniontown, Pa. | Wm. C. Hatfield 3 | C. H. Cale 17 C | W. F. Lane 3 C | W. L. Dunn 18 C | J. Nelson Mowls* B | Mrs. H. D. Hutchinson 3 B |
| University City, Mo. | David L. Millar 2 | E. L. Bruns 6 M | M. E. Bersseau 1 M | W. A. Heimbrucher 20 M | Charles Banks 10 B | |
| Urbana, Ill. | Lyman M. Hurd 2 | Bess M. Holmes 2 E | F. E. Williamson 2 M | E. M. Anderson* M | T. H. Cobb 6 B | Margaret Puterbaugh 8 B |
| Utica, N. Y. | Samuel Sloan 1 | A. V. Sisti, Jr. 11‡ | Jacob Tumposky 1‡ | John E. Foote 1‡ | John A. DeCamp 18 B | Laure C. Foucher 11 B |
| Valdosta, Ga. | J. D. Ashley 2 | J. B. Chisholm 2 M | O. W. Franklin 8 M | Charles A. Dunbar 3 M | A. G. Cleveland 16 B | Miss E. Havenkotte |
| Vallejo, Calif. | Fred H. Heegler 8 | Alf. E. Edgcumbe 24 C | Russell F. O'Hara 15 C | T. D. Kilkenny 20 C | Elmer L. Cave B | L. Gertrude Doyle 25 B |
| Valley Stream, N. Y. | J. H. Carey | F. G. Chalmers M | Louis Hicks M | Carroll McLaughlin M | Harry W. Gross 11 | Elizabeth F. Kelly |
| Vancouver, Wash. | E. A. Hamilton* | C. A. McDonah 8 E | D. Elwood Caples 6 E | C. C. Cartlich 8 M | P. F. Gaiser 1 B | Marion M. Pirkey 12 B |
| Vandergrift, Pa. | J. A. Grimm 1 | F. L. Young 7 C | H. R. Bair 7 C | L. G. Andeson 10 C | John R. Kurtz B | Jennie McKenzie 15 B |
| Ventura, Calif.† | Frank J. Dennis 2 | Grace Woodruff 1 A | Stacy C. Bates | Carl Froerer* A | W. K. Cobb* E | Elizabeth Topping 18‡ |
| Vicksburg, Miss. | J. E. Hamilton 4 | Margaret Clack 3 B | R. M. Kelly 3 B | John L. Hyland 7 B | H. V. Cooper 4 B | Mahala Birchett 9 B |
| Vincennes, Ind. | Jos. W. Kimmell 5 | Jos. I. Muentzer 5 E | Shuler McCormick* M | Robert E. Lind 5 M | V. L. Eikenberry 5 B | Jane Kitchell 5 B |
| Virginia, Minn. | P. E. Barker 5 | A. E. Bickford 33‡ | L. F. Burns 4‡ | C. S. Hovland 4‡ | H. R. Brown 4‡ | C. Reckzyl 6‡ |
| Waco, Tex.† | John F. Sheehy 2 | George D. Field 12 C | John McGlasson 12 C | J. H. Strange 9 C | B. B. Cobb 20 B | Ethel Simmons 13 B |
| Wakefield, Mass. | Asa A. Boothby 3 | F. S. Hartshorne 23 E | M. E. S. Clemons 33 C | Harry H. Denning 2 C | W. B. Atwell 24 B | Helen Carleton 10 B |

## Table VIII-A.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Mayor (All elected) | City Clerk | City Attorney | City Engineer | Superintendent of Schools | City Librarian |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Walla Walla, Wash. | Frank Richmond 2 | Ray Appling 7 C | T. P. Gose 2 C | Grove Cookerly 4 C | W. M. Kern 20 B | Ellen G. Smith 28 |
| Wallingford, Conn. | John P. Bridgett 15 | William B. Hall 7 E | William F. Wrynn 2 M | Wm. A. MacKenzie 25M | H. M. Jeffords 10 B | Dorothy Nunn 7‡ |
| Waltham, Mass. | F. L. MacDonald 1 | Richard Steele 23 C | George P. Drury 1 M | Henry F. Beal 5 M | William H. Slayton B | Leslie T. Little 12 B |
| Warren, Ohio | G. A. Bjorson 1 | Elizabeth J. Jones 3 C | Geo. Buchwalter 1 E | W. S. Harvey 12‡ | H. B. Turner 18 B | Josephine Lytle 15 B |
| Warren, Pa. | R. W. Steber 2 | M. L. Dougherty 10 C | S. D. Blackman 10 C | C. W. Barwis | J. G. Rossman 1 | Mary B. Nelson |
| Warwick, R. I. | John A. O'Brien* | Thomas P. Coates* M | Jos. W. Grimes* M | A. W. McGuiness* M | W. A. Sherman B | William H. Lane |
| Washington, D. C. | Melvin C. Hazen 1 | Roland M. Brennan* | E. B. Prettyman 1 | Dan I. Sultan* | Frank W. Ballou 14 | George F. Bowerman 14 |
| Washington, Pa. | Robert E. Griffiths | | | H. H. Streator | Meyer B. Horner 5 | Janet M. Clark |
| Waterbury, Conn. | Frank Hayes 5 | John Fitzmaurice 3 E | Chas. O'Conner 13 M | Robt. A. Cairns 44 C | Thomas Condon 2 B | Emelyn Barrett 6 B |
| Waterloo, Iowa | M. J. Morgan 5 | Charles C. MacKay 13 C | A. G. Reid 5 C | N. B. Barber 9 C | Chas. E. Kittrell 9 B | Callie Wieder 11 B |
| Watertown, Mass. | | Wm. P. McGuire 27 E | F. J. McNamara 4 C | Otis D. Allen 15 C | W. H. Price 27 B | L. W. Masters 30 B |
| Watertown, N. Y.† | John B. Harris 11 | M. E. Carnes 14 C | R. F. Taylor 2 A | F. E. O'Brien 5 A | C. E. Sabin 2 B | Karl George 6 B |
| Watertown, S. D. | B. N. Hagna 8 | | D. K. Loucks 4 M | E. H. Schulz 7 M | H. Mackenzie 8 | Ruth Longden 8 B |
| Watertown, Wis. | C. Lutovsky 5 | A. H. Stallman 7 E | H. W. Hartwig 1 E | Paul Schroeder 3 E | R. A. Buell 11 B | Florence C. Hays 8 B |
| Waterville, Me. | Robert Jackson* | Arthur J. Cratty C | Carl Blackington C | John Burleigh C | Charles Glover B | Mary Tobey 6 |
| Watervliet, N. Y.† | James F. Donlon 7 | Katharine D. Moran 14 M | Joseph D. Foley 10 M | Vincent J. Lamb 3 M | William Richmond 7 M | |
| Waukegan, Ill. | Peter W. Petersen 4 | John P. Wyllie 4 E | Wm. R. Behanna 4 M | H. B. Bleek 4 M | John S. Clark 15 B | Laura Perrin 20 B |
| Waukesha, Wis. | George W. Coutts 1 | Frances M. Martin 4 E | Vincent J. Collins 3 E | W. E. Dick 1 M | G. O. Banting 14 B | Mary Corson 13 B |
| Wausau, Wis. | Otto Muenchow 7 | Jay L. Brown 10 C | E. P. Gorman 7 C | B. C. Gowen 25 C | E. C. Hirsch 1 B | Cora Lansing 10 B |
| Wauwatosa, Wis. | A. C. Loose* | W. T. Whipp 6 E | L. C. Wheeler* M | T. S. Torkelson 6 M | W. T. Darling 10 | Miss Loveland 20 |
| Waycross, Ga.† | George R. Youmans 1 | Walter E. Lee 21 C | J. D. Blalock 8 C | H. M. Pafford 1 C | Ralph Newton 28 B | Elizabeth Blackshear 15B |
| Waynesboro, Pa.† | J. W. Croft 7 | A. Stover Fitz 26 C | N. F. Keller 7 C | Charles G. Sheaffer 8 C | D. J. Keener 5 B | Grace Hildebrand 6 B |
| Webster, Mass. | Joseph Patenaude 9 | John E. Hickey 27 E | T. R. Leboeuf 6 C | B. A. Wakefield 14 C | James A. Lobban 6 B | Phoebe Kingsbury 44 B |
| Webster Groves, Mo. | John B. Chipman 4 | George E. Waite 2 C | Alva C. Trueblood 6 C | J. B. Clayton, Jr. 8 C | W. E. Gaessling 5 B | Eleanor B. Manning 7 B |
| Wellesley, Mass. | Arthur L. Stevenson 5 | John T. Ryan 19 | Clarence A. Bunker 20 | A. S. Cassidy 20 | S. M. Graves 21 B | Kathleen Kennedy 10 B |
| Wenatchee, Wash. | C. B. Hughes 1 | Perk W. Low 1 | N. M. Sorenson 3 M | Harry Issler 1‡ | John Goddard 3 B | Alta Chambers 8 B |
| West Allis, Wis. | M. V. Baxter 3 | M. C. Henika 13 E | L. C. Gram 7 E | W. D. Darby 14 C | H. B. Nash 1 B | W. O. Mishoff 1 B |
| Westbrook, Me. | Rufus K. Jordan 5 | Harold N. Lord 3 E | Grover Welch 8 M | Henry W. Foster | Guy Sinclair 4 B | Jennie G. Andrews B |
| West Chester, Pa. | George J. Brinton 4 | Fred J. Wahl 2‡ | G. W. Kauver‡ | W. G. Colesworthy 2‡ | W. L. Phillips | Sarah P. Bedford |
| Westerly, R. I. | | E. E. Whipple 28 E | John Ferguson 10 C | | W. H. Bacon 21 B | Sallie E. Coy 4 |
| Westfield, Mass. | R. H. Cowing 3 | J. C. Dewey 8 C | Harry B. Putnam 3 M | Oren E. Parks 14 B | C. D. Stiles 16 B | H. T. Dougherty 8 |
| Westfield, N. J. | William H. Davies | | | John T. Hopkins | Charles A. Philhower 8 | Mary V. Gale 1 |
| West Frankfort, Ill. | W. M. Martin | William Green M | John Carr M | Z. A. Cox M | C. A. Waller B | Mrs. J. Holland M |
| West Hartford, Conn. | | C. C. Thomson 7 E | R. H. Deming 7 C | F. B. Chamberlin 1 C | L. H. Bugbee 15 B | Miss M. Burditt 10 B |
| West Haven, Conn. | George Charman 1 | Jerome Jermain 1 E | | B. A. Mehls, Jr. 1 C | Seth Haley | Miss Lewis |
| West New York, N. J. | Charles Daume 4 | Charles Swensen 19 E | Samuel Hirschberg 13 | Frank J. Oleri 13 | Harry L. Bain 6 | Jennie Thompson 12 |
| West Orange, N. J. | F. C. Erwin 12 | R. C. Alford 12‡ | A. J. Grosso 12‡ | Henry C. Warnick 15‡ | Solomon C. Strong 19 | |
| West Palm Beach, Fla.† | P. C. Reese 2 | J. R. Gardner 6 A | Paul W. Potter 1 A | George Brockway 5 A | J. A. Youngblood | Maude E. Clarke |
| West Springfield, Mass. | Henry S. Johnston 3 | Henry E. Schmuck 12 E | Whitfield Reid 2‡ | (Private Firm) | John R. Fausey 8 B | Marion Bowler 15 B |
| West Warwick, R. I. | | | | | John F. Deering 22 | |
| Wewoka, Okla. | H. W. Carver 2 | M. M. Sebastian 3 B | V. R. Biggers 4 B | Roy Grace 7 B | H. D. Simmons 8 B | Elaine Boylan 1 B |
| Weymouth, Mass. | Marshall F. Spear 1 | C. B. Merchant 15 E | Kenneth L. Nash 3 C | R. H. Whiting C | P. T. Pearson B | Christine E. Evarts 7 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wheeling, W. Va. | Gordon P. Fought 2 | Harry T. Clouse 2 C | P. J. McGinley 2 C | Harry Conrad 10 M | J. Springer 4 E | Edna Roberts 30 B |
| White Plains, N. Y. | Robert B. Smith | George Zechiel 6 | William Condit 11 | Eugene Halpin, Jr. | Claude Hardy 1 | Clara F. Hopper |
| Whiting, Ind. | James T. McNamara 4 | Edith Langenhan 4 E | James S. McCarthy 4 M | James G. Nellis 4 M | W. W. Borden B | Hazel Long B |
| Whittier, Calif. | Newton L. Adams 1 | Debbie E. Allen 5 E | Thomas W. Bewley 1 C | M. R. Bowen 10 C | Will E. Wiley 1 B | Ruth Ellis 11 B |
| Wichita, Kans.† | J. S. Crawford 1 | C. C. Ellis 9 A | Vincent Hiebsch 7 A | P. L. Brockway 18 A | L. W. Mayberry 21 B | Ruth Hammond 10 B |
| Wichita Falls, Tex.† | John T. Young 1 | J. H. Crouch* C | W. E. George* C | F. M. Rugeley 14 A | H. D. Fillers | Lucia F. Powell 12 B |
| Wilkes-Barre, Pa. | Chas. N. Loveland 2 | Harvey Weiss 6 C | Edwin B. Morgan 10‡ | Walter P. Johns 8 C | Allen E. Bacon 1 B | Mary N. Baker 4 B |
| Wilkinsburg, Pa. | William P. Yocum | | | Charles F. Sperling | William C. Graham 6 | Fred S. Evans 3 |
| Williamsport, Pa. | George K. Harris 3 | B. C. Houck 19 C | F. J. Cummings 26 C | L. W. Mussina 16 C | A. M. Weaver 9 B | O. H. W. Thomson 29 B |
| Willimantic, Conn. | James H. Hurley 3 | Arthur L. Clark 7 E | Arthur T. Kelley 3‡ | John F. Collins 3‡ | E. A. Case | L. Bernice Grimley 3‡ |
| Wilmette, Ill.† | C. P. Dubbs 4 | N. P. Miller 3 E | Willis D. Nance 4 M | W. A. Wolff 1 M | J. R. Harper B | Anne Whitmack B |
| Wilmington, Del. | William H. Speer 2 | David Hollett 2 C | E. E. Berl 2 M | H. Maier 8 B | S. M. Stouffer 10‡ | W. Bailey |
| Wilmington, N. C. | W. H. Blair 10 | J. R. Benson 5 C | W. B. Campbell* C | M. Maffitt 11 C | Ray Funderburk 3 B | Emma Woodward 10 B |
| Wilson, N. C.† | Charles B. McLean 11 | A. C. McKinnon 4 A | (Board of 3) 2 C | James D. Blount 6 A | K. R. Curtis 6 B | Mrs. W. M. Moss 6 C |
| Winchester, Mass. | | Mabel W. Stinson 15 E | Addison R. Pike 15 C | Parker Holbrook 2 C | James J. Quinn 12 B | Cora A. Quimby 47 B |
| Winchester, Va.† | C. R. Anderson 2 | Clark M. Smith 3 E | James P. Reardon 5 C | Walker Bond 5 A | G. R. Quarles 4 B | C. Vernon Eddy B |
| Winnetka, Ill.† | William B. Moulton 6 | Stella Winslow 11 E | F. Dickinson 19 C | Frank Windes 26 A | C. Washburne 15 B | Mary Hewes 15 B |
| Winona, Minn. | James B. Rice | George W. Hofmann‡ | H. M. Lamberton, Jr.‡ | E. E. Chadwick‡ | | Jeannette Clarke 34 |
| Winston-Salem, N. C. | Geo. W. Coan, Jr. 6 | F. J. Peterson, Jr. 6 C | (Law Firm) 12 B | Harry L. Shaner | John W. Moore 2 B | Janet C. Berkeley 10 |
| Winthrop, Mass. | Leonard C. Atkinson 3 | D. S. McLeod 4 E | Fred W. Fisher 1 C | Channing Howard | Edward R. Clark 18 B | Dorothy Kenney 20 B |
| Woburn, Mass. | Edward W. Kenney | William E. Kane 3 C | J. H. McLaughlin M | James H. McDermott‡ | George I. Clapp B | William D. Goddard B |
| Woonsocket, R. I. | Felix A. Toupin 4 | Raymond A. Jarret E | Morris Yaraus 1 E | Alphonse A. Fugere 2 E | James F. Rockett 8 E | Grace H. Hall 11 |
| Wooster, Ohio | William L. Long 1 | Helen R. Walter 3 E | Marion F. Graven 1 E | J. E. Fox 10 M | C. M. Layton 3 B | Mrs. E. W. Glen |
| Worcester, Mass. | John C. Mahoney 4 | M. C. Midgley 10 C | Walter D. Allen 5 C | Ralph G. Lingley 10 C | Walter S. Young 14 B | Robert K. Shaw 25 B |
| Wyandotte, Mich. | Thomas A. Davis 3 | L. J. LaCourse 4 E | W. Hugh Williams 4 M | F. W. Liddle 2 M | Fred W. Frostic 18 B | Mae Girardin 5 B |
| Xenia, Ohio† | Jacob Kany 8 | A. V. Perrill* C | W. A. Miller 6 C | John C. Connley | L. Hammerle | Miss P. Dennis |
| Yakima, Wash. | H. C. Temple 3 | Pearl Benjamin‡ | Don M. Tunstall M | C. E. Crownover M | A. C. Davis M | Helen Remsberg‡ |
| Yonkers, N. Y. | Joseph F. Loehr 3 | William H. McCabe 3 C | L. G. McAnaney 3 M | Chris J. Sheridan 7 M | Lamont Hodge 13 B | Griton I. Will 2 B |
| York, Pa. | Harry B. Anstine 3 | Henry Butler 7 C | F. B. Gerber 9 C | C. F. W. Wallow 18 C | Mr. Ferguson 5 B | Katharine Shorey 1 |
| Youngstown, Ohio | Mark E. Moore 3 | John H. Lemon 11 C | U. F. Kistler 3 M | Grant M. Cook 3 M | Geo. E. Roudebush 4 B | C. W. Sumner 8 B |
| Ypsilanti, Mich. | Ray H. Burrell 1 | H. C. Holmes 16 C | John P. Kirk 10 C | T. Fred Older 15 C | E. H. Chappelle 1 B | Lottie M. Coombs 10‡ |
| Zanesville, Ohio. | Wm. P. Wetherald 1 | Albert L. Basehart 5 C | B. E. Leasure 1 M | George Evans 1‡ | C. T. Prose 7 B | Mable Henderson 4 B |

## Table VIII-B

## DIRECTORY OF CITY OFFICIALS IN ALL CITIES OVER 10,000

Name, length of service, and method of selecting city officials as reported in February, 1935. Length of service in present position to nearest year is indicated by a figure following the name; an asterisk (*) indicates less than one year's service. Letters after names: "E" indicates elected official; "A" appointed by city manager; "B" appointed by board other than council; "C" appointed by city council; "M" appointed by mayor; ‡ indicates appointed officials, the appointing agency not being reported. Under the heading "Chief Finance Officer," "a" indicates that the official's title is city auditor, and "c" indicates either city comptroller or city controller. In some instances assessors are chairmen or clerks of boards of assessors.

| City | Chief Finance Officer | City Assessor | City Treasurer | Purchasing Agent | Health Officer | Director of Public Welfare |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aberdeen, S. D. | L. W. Kohlhoff 15 B$^{a}$ | J. G. Barger 4 B | Marie Brown 8 B | | J. F. Adams 3 B | |
| Aberdeen, Wash. | Victor Lindberg 3 E$^{c}$ | | Tom Freeman 1 E | | B. O. Swinehart 5 M | |
| Abilene, Tex. | M. V. Womack | Earl Hughes 2 M | C. M. Cooley 3 M | | Joe Shelton 6 M | |
| Ada, Okla. | Albert Chamberlain 2 E | | Albert Chamberlain 2 E | Albert Chamberlain 2 E | O. E. Welbourn 2 C | J. D. Willoughby 2 E |
| Adams, Mass. | A. Millard Daniels M | William A. Steuer E | Guy Crosier E | | William A. Sime E | Harry E. Davis C |
| Adrian, Mich. | Karl B. Hoch 1 E | S. Howard Swift 4 C | Fred L. Johnson 5 E | G. Percy Love 18 E | W. S. MacKenzie 4 C | |
| Akron, Ohio | Ross F. Walker 1 M | | | William H. Kroeger 1 M | M. D. Ailes 8 B | J. M. Zang |
| Alameda, Calif. | E. J. Croll 26 E | E. J. Croll 26 E | Homer Dallas 7 E | Ralph M. Bryant 3 C | F. B. Gailbraith 2 A | Mrs. P. McCoskey 2 A |
| Albany, Ga. | E. A. Fry* M | J. H. Mock 5 C | Mrs. S. T. Dillingham 4 C | C. Q. Wright 10 C | W. D. Martin 8 A | |
| Albany, N. Y. | L. J. Ehrhardt 12 E$^{c}$ | N. J. Fahrenkoff 4 M | Frank J. O'Brien 2 E | Peter J. Manweiler 13 M | Daniel J. O'Leary 1 M | Leo M. Doody 13 M |
| Albert Lea, Minn. | W. H. Sherman 3 A | A. E. Carlsen 5 A | Ila Dudley 5 A | R. L. VanNocker 1 C | F. W. Calhoun 1 A | |
| Albuquerque, N. Mex. | Charles Wells | | J. B. Horoho 2 A | A. B. Betz 1 A | James R. Scott | |
| Alexandria, La. | | | J. H. Brewer 8 C | | R. B. Wallace 4 M | |
| Alexandria, Va. | Charles H. Jett 3 A$^{a}$ | Chas. H. Callahan 40 E (County) | Roger C. Sullivan 10 E | | W. Lewis Schafer 5 A | A. W. Boehringer |
| Alhambra, Calif. | R. B. Wallace 2 E$^{a}$ | | Evelyn T. Caulk 2 E | J. H. Coulter 4 C | S. J. Stewart | |
| Aliquippa, Pa. | | W. D. Roberts 12 E | T. C. Swarts 9 C | J. W. McElheny 8 C | J. E. Tanner 15 B | |
| Allentown, Pa. | James F. Brown 1 E | John J. Yingling 3 C | Jerry F. Kern 3 E | | J. Treichler Butz 20 C | |
| Alliance, Ohio | H. F. Bohecker 3 E$^{a}$ | | Geo. F. Schweikart 7 E | | G. O. Roland 1 M | |
| Alpena, Mich. | A. M. Hopperstead 1 M | Anthony Nowak 1 M | Richard W. Reynolds 1 M | Geo. R. Nicholson 14 M | F. J. O'Donnel 2 M | |
| Alton, Ill. | Leo H. Ernst 2 M$^{c}$ | Louis Berner 1 E | M. M. Caldwell 6 E | | Wm. S. McGinnis 1 M | |
| Altoona, Pa. | William T. Canan 11 E$^{c}$ | L. A. Woomer 15 C | John R. Martin 11 E | L. M. Moses 3 C | Raymond A. Herbert 3 C | |
| Amarillo, Tex. | J. M. Barker 2 A$^{a}$ | P. C. Burks 2 A | LeVerne Calhoun 5 A | H. R. Smith 2 C | B. M. Primer 4 A | F. E. DeCoster 4 B |
| Ambridge, Pa. | | | Charles Martin 2‡ | | Louis Herrmann 25‡ | |
| Ames, Iowa | J. W. Prather 1 C | Milo A. Manning 15 E | H. W. Stafford 17 E | A. A. Magill 1 C | B. D. Atchley 1 M | |
| Amesbury, Mass. | Agnes E. Greaney 15 C | (Board of 3) E | James W Clark 12 E | | Clarence Morse 8 E | Lillian M. Brady 5 B |
| Amsterdam, N. Y. | | John Redpath‡ | Frank Howlan E | | P. Fitzgibbons 1 E | Victoria Sierzega 1 E |
| Anaconda, Mont. | A. J. Eamon 3 E | | E. McAndrews 2 E | Thomas Ferguson 2 M | J. J. Malee 2 M | |
| Anaheim, Calif. | Leo J. Sheridan 1 E | Charles E. Griffith 1 | Cas A. Boege 3 E | Leo J. Sheridan 1 C | K. H. Sutherland | Mona Price 12 M |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anderson, Ind. | J. J. Netterville 2 M$^c$ | | | | G. B. Metcalf 3 M | |
| Anderson, S. C. | | (County) | E. V. Shealy 3 C | | E. E. Epting 7 B | |
| Annapolis, Md. | E. M. Jackson, Jr. 2 | J. Carson Busch 12 | George F. Quaid C | | J. J. Murphy 3 C | |
| Ann Arbor, Mich. | | Herbert W. Crippen E | William F. Verner 2 M | Fred C. Perry 6 E | John A. Wessinger 25 M | George McCollum 3 C |
| Anniston, Ala. | | | L. O. Treadaway 2 E | W. S. Coleman 2 E | George A. Cryer | |
| Ansonia, Conn. | | (Board of 5)‡ | Frederick M. Drew 2 E | | L. H. Wilmot 2‡ | John E. Waters 2‡ |
| Appleton, Wis. | | George E. Peotter 9 E | J. A. Kox 3 E | | F. P. Dohearty 8 B | |
| Ardmore, Okla. | C. F. Adams 4 M | | Orah M. Bryant 14 A | C. F. Adams 4 M | A. Y. Easterwood 16 A | |
| Arkansas City, **Kans.** | James F. Clough 2 A | | Thomas L. McAdam 2 A | Clyde B. King 4‡ | O. E. Strodtman 7 A | |
| Arlington, Mass. | Clarence Needham 10 C | Earle A. Ryder | Charles A. Hardy 14 E | | Wm. H. Bradley 21 B | Clifford W. Cook 2 C |
| Arnold, Pa. | Joe Bruncsak 2‡ | | H. Burns Smith 2 C | | James Lemon 2 C | Joe Carroll 2 C |
| Asbury Park, N. J. | | Wm. E. Harrison 20 C | Linwood Shepherd 11 C | Joseph M. Newsome A | Budd H. Obert 31 B | C. O. Davenport |
| Asheville, N. C. | George L. Hackney 2 C | W. J. Penland | | C. E. Sawyer 2 A | John W. Williams* A | E. Grace Miller 19 |
| Ashland, Ky. | A. N. Richardson 11 A$^a$ | Mollie DeBord 3 E | Fanny C. Miranda 3 E | W. A. Horton 1 A | R. D. Higgins 15 B | |
| Ashland, Ohio | Lotta Westover 2 E | | Lotta Westover 2 E | W. Art Mason 2 E | R. P. Bognaird 2 M | R. P. Bognaird 2 M |
| Ashland, Wis. | W. C. Morris 22 M$^c$ | C. J. McGeehan 14 M | Evelyn M. White 6 E | Evelyn M. White 6‡ | C. O. Hertzman 12 M | |
| Ashtabula, Ohio | Jay H. Shaw 9 C$^a$ | | E. H. Burrill 7 C | Carey S. Sheldon 2 C | J. H. Park 3 C | J. W. O'Brien 2 A |
| Astoria, Ore. | O. K. Atwood 12 C$^a$ | | Oswald Gustafson 5 C | James O. Convill* C | Nellie Vernon 25 C | |
| Atchison, Kans. | A. W. Seng 8 B | | J. F. Clingan 1 A | A. W. Seng 8 B | W. K. Fast 1 A | |
| Athens, Ga. | | | James Barrow 16 M | | W. W. Brown 3 B | |
| Athol, Mass. | Wm. K. Wheeler 4 C | (Board of 3) E | C. W. Faulkner 11 E | | Marion B. Sitley | R. B. Waterman 20 E |
| Atlanta, Ga. | B. Graham West 17 E$^c$ | (Board of 3) | H. B. Kennedy 5 C | L. A. Walker 4 C | J. P. Kennedy 34 C | |
| Atlantic City, N. J. | Frank B. Off* | Harold W. Cain 7 M | Frank B. Off* M | A. C. Patterson 3 | Samuel L. Salasin 15 M | George Ortlip 1 |
| Attleboro, Mass. | Earl L. Swift C | Herbert L. Perry 6 M | Wm. Marshall 5 E | | Ralph P. Kent* M | (Board of 3) M |
| Auburn, Me. | G. A. Arnold 8 C | E. A. Whitney 12 C | W. P. Atwood 12 C | F. W. Ford, Jr. 9 | C. W. Steele 1 A | G. A. Arnold 9 |
| Auburn, N. Y. | R. W. Swart 3 A$^c$ | Frank Dullea 3 A | J. B. Jaeckel 3 A | S. W. Stirling 3 A | John W. Copeland 5 A | Lucille G. Chisholm 5 A |
| Augusta, Ga. | C. G. Paschal$^c$ | C. Gordan Lamback | W. H. Bagby | J. W. Westmoreland | E. E. Murphey | L. B. Furtick |
| Augusta, Me. | S. Sewall Webster 6 M$^a$ | (Board of 3) M | Alfred J. Lacasse 6 M | | George A. Coombs 6 M | F. Lester Judkins* M |
| Aurora, Ill. | John P. Wetz 14 E | Recea Reed 8 E | Michael Weiler 14 C | J. P. Wetz | George W. Haan 16 C | |
| Austin, Minn. | | Alex Campbell 6 E | L. H. Williams 6 E | | P. A. Lommen 1 M | |
| Austin, **Tex.** | George G. Grant 6 A | T. B. Marshall 7 A | Walter Bremond, Jr. 1 A | L. R. Sanford 2 A | Banner Gregg 2 C | E. O. Chimene 2 A |
| Bakersfield, Calif. | V. Van Riper 16 C$^a$ | Dean R. Hurley 6 C | H. H. Smith 7 C | F. W. Nighbert 2 C | P. J. Cuneo 20 A | |
| Baltimore, Md. | R. Walter Graham 4 E$^c$ | Thomas W. Hall 4 M | | J. H. Gaston 4 M | H. Williams 6 M | T. J. S. Waxter 6 M |
| Bangor, Me. | S. G. Robinson 5 C$^a$ | William J. Largay 2 C | Charles E. Millett 5 C | Harry E. Torrens 3 C | Harry D. McNeil 15 A | Mary L. Turpin 3 A |
| Barberton, Ohio | Chas. A. Gardner 1 E$^a$ | | Mary M. Streeter 1 E | | H. A. Finefrock 6 B | Paul L. Maloney 1 M |
| Barre, Vt. | | | Ralph Olliver 9 E | | M. F. Cerasoli 3 M | John R. Milne 5 M |
| Bartlesville, Okla. | | | Don Beger 8 A | Ross Taylor 8 C | Miss E. Chamberlin 10 A | Effie McHam 4 B |
| Batavia, N. Y. | Allen W. Gillard 8 E | William C. Casey 6 C | John C. Pratt 12 E | Frank H. Webber 4 C | E. F. Will 6 B | Ralph J. Burdett 2 C |
| Baton Rouge, La. | L. J. Ricaud 21 E | | L. J. Ricaud 26 | J. J. Fourrier 11‡ | T. J. McHugh 12 M | Mrs. C. C. Devall 12 |
| Battle Creek, Mich. | G. J. Genebach 2 E | William Kennedy 15 C | H. R. Atkinson 2 C | Thomas C. Thorne 30 C | A. A. Hoyt 15 C | A. A. Hoyt 1 C |
| Bay City, Mich. | O. A. Kasemeyer 2 C | W. Pearsall 2 C | A. R. Gray* C | O. A. Kasemeyer 2 C | G. W. Moore 13 A | Bertha K. Bunn 4 A |
| Bayonne, N. J. | Frederick Krum 4 C$^c$ | Timothy Doolan 2 C | John F. Ryan C | Raymond Murray 4 C | William W. Brooke‡ | Jerome Brady 4 E |
| Beacon, N. Y. | Harry Straney 1 E | Thurlow Weed 1 E | | Thurlow Weed 1 E | Charles B. Dugan‡ | Philip Rowland 1 E |
| Beatrice, Nebr. | Fred A. Wertz 1 C | | Fred A. Wertz 1 E | W. P. McClanahan 1 C | J. R. Liebe 1 C | J. B. High 3 B |
| Beaumont, Tex. | William Wahrmund$^a$ | C. J. Strack 14 A | | Raymond Edmonds 10 A | W. W. Dunn 1‡ | Fred Colby |

## Table VIII-B.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Chief Finance Officer | City Assessor | City Treasurer | Purchasing Agent | Health Officer | Director of Public Welfare |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Beaver Falls, Pa. | John S. Tress 3 E | Harry Rewbridge 5 C | Eugene I. Newell 5 E | | William Elmes* C | |
| Bedford, Ind. | Henry S. Murray 5 E | | Charles E. Johnson* | | Charles Blackburn 5 M | |
| Bellaire, Ohio | Ed. Kinkade 5 E$^a$ | | H. C. Glaser 5 E | | W. J. Shepard 14 B | |
| Belleville, Ill. | | | John J. Dengler 2 E | | Frank Kern 2 M | |
| Belleville, N. J. | William H. Williams 5 | J. F. Coogan, Jr. 5 E | T. R. Sargent 9‡ | | E. A. Berry 9‡ | J. A. King 1 E |
| Bellevue, Pa. | | | C. E. Braden 16 C | | T. A. McNary* B | |
| Bellingham, Wash. | J. H. Stevenson 9 E | | J. E. McGinnis 1 E | | I. W. Powell 7 B | |
| Belmont, Mass. | | (Board of 3) E | Francis J. Lally 1 E | | Thomas F. Harris 21 B | Arthur E. Hough 17 C |
| Beloit, Wis. | | H. L. McCarthy 6 A | David Throne 10 A | George B. Ingersoll 2 | R. S. Vivian 4 A | (County) |
| Benton Harbor, Mich. | Geo. W. Larkworthy 6 C | B. S. Barnes 5 C | Geo. W. Larkworthy 6 C | H. H. Crow | E. R. Taylor 2 A | George S. Barnard 4 |
| Berkeley, Calif. | Mabel Jenson 8 E$^a$ | Harry Squires 28 A | Pauline Young 11 A | Harry L. Davisson 5 A | Frank L. Kelley 6 A | Marjorie Carpenter 8 A |
| Berlin, N. H. | H. B. Hasbell 1 M$^a$ | (Board of 3) M | George A. Bell 3 M | | E. A. Marcoux 9 M | |
| Berwick, Pa. | | (Board of 4) 3 E | Harry H. Straub* C | | Charles Ross 6 B | |
| Berwyn, Ill. | Ernest W. Mau* M | E. J. Drije 2 E | Leslie M. Moysey 2 E | Ernest W. Mau* M | Arthur P. Herron 2 E | |
| Bessemer, Ala. | R. P. Yount | | J. M. Scott | Jap Bryant E | R. V. Hazlewood | |
| Bethlehem, Pa. | Thomas W. Scott 5 E | Harry Becker 1 C | Earle H. Getter 5 E | Ed. McGlathery 3 C | Ed. Brader 17 C | Robert Pfeifle 5 E |
| Beverly, Mass. | Bertha L. Hayward 15 C$^a$ | William R. Brooks 5 C | John C. Lovett 9 C | | Alonzo Woodbury 17 B | Carrie Masury 2 B |
| Beverly Hills, Calif. | | (County) | H. L. Blackman 2 E | | Charles F. Nelson 9 C | |
| Biddeford, Me. | (Board of 3) | Thomas H. Simpson M | Fred H. Mitchell M | | John W. Mahoney M | Henry Boisvert M |
| Big Spring, Tex. | E. V. Spence 3 C | Herbert W. Whitney 2 A | Herbert W. Whitney 2 A | E. V. Spence 3 C | M. H. Bennett | E. V. Spence 3 C |
| Billings, Mont. | C. J. Chapple 4 E | | M. C. Stolt 8 E | | E. G. Balsam 4 M | |
| Biloxi, Miss. | F. A. Tucei E | F. A. Tucei E | F. A. Tucei E | | E. E. Moore‡ | |
| Binghamton, N. Y. | John E. Hogan 3 A | M. C. Duffy 1 A | Archie B. Jones 3 A | C. A. Harrell 3 C | C. J. Longstreet 18 A | H. S. Tolley 3 A |
| Birmingham, Ala. | C. E. Armstrong 11 C$^c$ | | | J. E. Shelton 9 C | J. D. Dowling 17 B | |
| Bismarck, N. D. | M. H. Atkinson 15 C | J. A. Graham 4 C | A. J. Arnot 20 C | M. H. Atkinson 15 C | A. M. Fisher 2 C | |
| Bloomfield, N. J. | Amy T. Wood 16 C | Harry E. Demarest 8 C | Raymond Edgerley 10 | J. W. Obreiter 1 | J. C. Saile 21 B | |
| Bloomington, Ill. | John A. Cleary 5 M$^c$ | George Martin 2 E | Bert A. Harvey 2 E | | B. Markowitz 3 M | |
| Bloomington, Ind. | Robert Wiles C | George Stogsdill E | Vanna Thrasher E | Arthur H. Berndt E | R. A. DeMotte | Mary Waldron |
| Bluefield, W. Va. | | | E. P. Mitchell 2 B | | David B. Lepper 9 A | |
| Blue Island, Ill. | L. F. Schwartz | | Fred A. Rice 2 E | | Louis Burkhart 20 M | |
| Blytheville, Ark. | J. F. Lentia$^a$ | | Jack Robinson E | | A. M. Washburn | |
| Bogalusa, La. | D. T. Cushing 5 E | | D. T. Cushing 5 E | K. I. Bean* M | J. H. Slaughter 12 C | R. R. Starnes* E |
| Boise, Idaho | M. P. Mehalin E | R. D. Leonardson E | Maude L. Casha‡ | Maude L. Casha‡ | W. H. Rhodes‡ | W. H. Rhodes‡ |
| Boone, Iowa | C. W. Conard 4 E | John Mathers 4 E | Otto Hile 1 E | George A. Nelson 10 C | William Woodburn 16 M | |
| Boston, Mass. | Charles J. Fox 1 M$^a$ | Edward T. Kelly 16 M | John H. Dorsey 1 M | Warren W. Loomis 1 M | F. X. Mahoney 13 M | J. C. L. Dowling 1‡ |
| Boulder, Colo. | Mayme Graham 14 A | (County) | | | H. L. Morency 2 A | Rudolph Johnson 5 A |
| Bowling Green, Ky. | | J. Mott Williams 2 C | Jones E. Mercer 6 C | | George M. Wells | |
| Braddock, Pa. | W. J. Tracey 8 C | John Whitfield 1 E | | | James Wills 14 B | |
| Bradford, Pa. | | E. C. Charlton 34 C | E. M. Travis 3 E | | R. G. Vogel 4 C | |
| Brainerd, Minn. | | M. E. Hitch 12 E | George A. Tracy 4 E | (Board of 3) | V. E. Quanstrom 2 C | |
| Braintree, Mass. | Henry W. Grady 3‡ | (Board of 3) E | Otis B. Oakman 16 E | (Selectmen) | Frank E. Stronach | (Selectmen) |
| Brawley, Calif. | | O. May Juvenal 14 E | Cyril B. Markling 3 E | O. F. Weissgerber* C | John L. Parker 6 C | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bremerton, Wash. | C. S. Halverson 10 E | | H. R. Jones 1 | E. J. McCall 4 M | D. H. Polk 10 M | |
| Bridgeport, Conn. | John J. O'Rourke 4 M | Wm. F. Connelly 10 B | John Shenton 2 E | Donald Meath 4 B | Richard O. Shea 3 B | Angus P. Thorne 17 B |
| Bridgeton, N. J. | Michael Steinbrook 6 M$^{c}$ | (Board of 3) M | J. Reeves Watson 8 E | | John G. Robbins 9 B | J. M. Stratton 8 C |
| Bristol, Conn. | (Board of Finance) 2 M | (Board of 3) M | Joseph T. Donovan 1 E | Allen W. Hall 2 B | B. B. Robbins 8 M | W. F. Smithwick 17 M |
| Bristol, Pa. | Wm. G. Buckman 10 E$^{a}$ | Louis B. Girton 5 E | Wm. J. Lefferts 5 C | | John M. Wright 12 C | |
| Bristol, R. I. | | (Board of 3) E | William Angevine 1 E | | Daniel Dyer 2 C | |
| Bristol, Tenn. | G. W. Vance 1 E | A. A. Overbay 1 C | W. K. Carson 14 C | Arthur Green 3 C | F. L. Moore B | Fred V. Vance 6 E |
| Brockton, Mass. | Chester T. Swanson 4$^{a}$ | (Board of 3) 3 | Leo V. Clancy 4 | | David B. Tuholski | John P. Murphy |
| Brookfield, Ill. | | | James O. Rezek 1 M | | Harriet Hoeckendorf 1 M | |
| Brookline, Mass. | Leon L. Allen 12 C | M. D. Mealey 4 E | Albert P. Briggs 12 E | | Francis P. Denny 28 B | Kate Ellis 2 B |
| Brownsville, Tex. | F. E. Grider$^{a}$ | J. B. Puckett 2 A | Mrs. H. Van Horn 5 A | E. S. Grider 15 A | T. A. Kinder 3 C | |
| Brownwood, Tex. | | H. Gresham 4‡ | | W. H. Thompson 1‡ | A. Horn 1‡ | |
| Brunswick, Ga. | F. J. Torras | R. R. MacGregor 2 A | J. P. Brooks 6 A | F. Symons 10 A | M. E. Winchester 2‡ | F. J. Torras 5 |
| Bucyrus, Ohio | Constance R. Keller 9 E$^{a}$ | | Esther M. Dobbins 5 E | | W. G. Carlisle M | |
| Buffalo, N. Y. | William A. Eckert 7 E$^{c}$ | (Board of 3) M | James D. Hoban 1 M | Joseph L. Downing 1 M | Francis E. Fronczak 25 B | Robert M. Smyth 1 |
| Burbank, Calif. | J. B. Brown 2 E | (County) | J. B. Brown 2 E | H. I. Stites‡ | T. H. Ransom‡ | |
| Burlingame, Calif. | Frank A. Bloom 10 E | James R. Murphy 25 E | Frank A. Bloom 10 E | Frank A. Bloom 10 | Wade Macomber C | |
| Burlington, Iowa | Frank N. LaPoint 5 E | Theo. W. Schaefer 23 C | George J. Bruhl 11 C | | George A. Kramer 1 C | |
| Burlington, N. J. | Howard E. Gordon* | (Board of 3) | | | Kathryn Phillips 1 | |
| Burlington, Vt. | (Board of Finance) | R. L. Soule 7 C | W. O. Lane 8 C | | Earl F. Foster 5 B | Ethel B. Mildram 6 B |
| Butler, Pa. | J. Paul Doen$^{c}$ | | | | J. Fred Leetch | |
| Butte, Mont. | J. M. Brown 2 C | | Bernerd E. Holland 2 E | P. C. Dineen 4 M | Joseph J. Kane 4 M | |
| Cairo, Ill. | Ernest Nordman 29 C$^{c}$ | | Ernest Nordman 25 C | | C. L. Weber 8 C | |
| Calumet City, Ill. | | | H. A. Lamprell 2 E | | E. S. O'Brien | |
| Cambridge, Mass. | John McKenzie 5 M$^{a}$ | (Board of 3) E | William J. Shea 4 M | Charles McCue 1 M | Leo T. Miles | James Finnegan B |
| Cambridge, Ohio | Jennie A. Diehl 1 M$^{a}$ | | Lilian W. Ruby 3 E | | Carl M. Oshe 1 B | |
| Camden, N. J. | Harold W. Bennett 4 E | (Board of 3) C | | Wm. M. Dilmore 10 C | A. L. Stone 11 M | D. S. Rhone 9 E |
| Campbell, Ohio | | | John M. Kadilak 1 E | Joseph Moore 1 M | J. S. Mariner 10 B | Joseph Moore 1 M |
| Canonsburg, Pa. | | | | | Frank Milligan | |
| Canton, Ill. | | | | | C. J. Johnston | |
| Canton, Ohio | John Eisenhauer 2 | | John Eisenhauer | O. O. Albright 2 M | F. M. Sayre 2 B | |
| Cape Girardeau, Mo. | Frank Batchelor 1 E | L. H. Butler 1 B | H. Bremermann 5 B | | Lee Slagle 1‡ | |
| Carbondale, Pa. | D. A. Duffy 3 E | M. McDonough 1‡ | W. L. Monahan 3 E | | W. J. Fenton 1 C | |
| Carlisle, Pa. | Howard T. Upland$^{a}$ | | Frank L. Hoffer 1 C | | U. Grant Eppley 2 B | |
| Carnegie, Pa. | | (County) | James Gamble 10 E | | Joseph Lewis | |
| Carteret, N. J. | Alexander Comba 1 M$^{a}$ | Edward Casey 28 E | | | Frank C. Born 34 B | |
| Casper, Wyo. | Le Roy Joyce$^{a}$ | | C. A. Cullen 1 M | | J. C. Kamp | |
| Cedar Rapids, Iowa | L. D. Burgus 3 E | V. E. Vane 27‡ | M. F. Cox 14 C | | V. H. Hasek 1‡ | Alma E. Hurtz |
| Central Falls, R. I. | | James J. Doyle 2 C | Joseph T. Curran 2 C | | Charles S. Doucet 2 C | Patrick Philbin 2 C |
| Centralia, Ill. | John W. Stedelin 4 E | | Miss C. Sundermeyer 4 M | | H. E. Wilson 4 M | |
| Chambersburg, Pa. | | | William M. Pentz 1‡ | | Frank J. Croft B | |
| Champaign, Ill. | E. T. Bassett 4 E | A. R. Scott E | J. F. Smith 4 C | | C. George Appelle C | |
| Chanute, Kans. | H. E. Coulter 10 E | | E. E. Lofgren 1 C | | R. A. Light 1 C | |
| Charleroi, Pa. | Joseph M. Brand 4 C | George W. Moody 4 E | (Bank) | | J. M. Hill 2 C | |
| Charleston, S. C. | R. G. White 9 C$^{c}$ | R. G. White 9 C | R. G. White 9 C | C. H. Webb* M | Leon Banov 9 B | C. Floride Bissell |
| Charleston, W. Va. | E. Silman$^{a}$ | | John D. Price E | H. C. Walker M | Hugh B. Robins M | |

TABLE VIII-B.—DIRECTORY OF CITY OFFICIALS IN ALL CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued

| City | Chief Finance Officer | City Assessor | City Treasurer | Purchasing Agent | Health Officer | Director of Public Welfare |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Charlotte, N. C. | M. L. Westmoreland 3 C$^a$ | J. A. Henderson C | L. L. Ledbetter 3 C | J. B. Pridgen 4 C | G. L. Rea 4 C | |
| Charlottesville, Va. | Seth Burnley 2 C | J. F. Fowler 6 E | Earnest Pugh 2 E | Seth Burnley 1 C | C. H. Eller B | Mrs. M. L. Grant A |
| Chattanooga, Tenn. | F. K. Rosamond 2$^a$ | S. S. Swafford | Alvin Shipp 3 | Mercer Reynolds | Fred J. McIsaac | E. D. Bass 8 |
| Chelsea, Mass. | Vincent Cassani 14 E$^a$ | Charles J. Donahoe 3 E | Geo. F. Hederson 12 E | | John F. Welch 10 B | Robert E. Coyne 3 B |
| Chester, Pa. | John J. Luttrell 3 E | Albert H. Hughes 11 C | S. P. Gray 3 E | Walter H. Craig 9 E | H. C. Donahoo 11 C | |
| Cheyenne, Wyo. | Ed. Warren 1 E | (County) | Ed. Warren 1 E | | H. R. Dillman 1 M | |
| Chicago, Ill. | R. B. Upham 2 M$^c$ | (County) | James A. Kearns 4 E | John A. Cervenka 4 M | H. N. Bundesen 4 M | Elizabeth Conkey 4 |
| Chicago Heights, Ill. | W. H. Freeman 8 E | Harry Green 12 C | C. F. Kirgis 14‡ | D. P. Bergin 8 E | I. C. Harman* C | |
| Chickasha, Okla. | C. A. Chinchall 2 M | | Eula McGranahan 2 E | J. J. Conrad 1 M | E. L. Dawson 6 M | |
| Chicopee, Mass. | Sebastian Kordas E$^a$ | William H. Trumball C | Louis M. Dufault E | | Gertrude M. Dewitt‡ | Thomas P. McElhone‡ |
| Chillicothe, Ohio | Louis A. Hibbler$^a$ | | William E. Tunnell 1 E | Tom Hughes 1 E | Dr. Bower 1 B | |
| Cicero, Ill. | Frank J. Creszic 3$^a$ | Henry R. Schwarzel 3 E | A. F. Maciejewski 3 E | Jerry Viterna 3 E | Frank J. Pokorney 3 | |
| Cincinnati, Ohio | Henry Urner 7 M$^a$ | (County) | S. W. McGrath 7 A | C. E. Lex, Jr. 6 A | O. C. Fisk 1 B | Fred K. Hoehler 1 A |
| Clairton, Pa. | V. E. Ohl 1 E | P. G. Miller 1 C | D. J. Patterson 7 E | | W. F. Connelly 5 C | |
| Claremont, N. H. | Henry Hawkins$^a$ | | | | William P. Prescott | |
| Clarksburg, W. Va. | | | Mirth H. Kuhl 2 A | James S. Rodney 1 | J. E. Stephenson 4 A | |
| Clarksdale, Miss. | | R. E. Stratton, Jr. 19 | R. E. Stratton, Jr. 19 | | N. C. Knight | |
| Cleburne, Tex. | | Joe B. Post 10 E | Miss Johnnie Gordon 6 M | J. S. Hoffman 3 E | J. M. Stalcup 2 M | |
| Cleveland, Ohio | Louis C. West 2 M | John A. Zangerle | R. V. Johnson 2 M | Frank Milton 2 M | Harold J. Knapp M | David Ingalls 2 M |
| Cleveland Hghts., Ohio | H. M. Kimpel 3 C$^a$ | (County) | H. M. Kimpel 3 C | H. H. Canfield 13 | Robert Lockhart 13 A | H. H. Canfield 13 |
| Cliffside Park, N. J. | Herbert L. Post 12 E | Nelson Neumann 9 E | | | Fred Dyer B | S. C. Gozzo 10 M |
| Clifton, N. J. | John Franz 6 C | (Board of 2) C | John Franz 6 C | William A. Miller 9 C | J. P. Quinlan 15 C | Jacob Van Brockhaven |
| Clinton, Iowa | Marvin C. Schreiner | | | | Leslie K. Fenlon | |
| Clinton, Mass. | Charles A. Graf$^a$ | | | | Frederick E. Murphy | |
| Coatesville, Pa. | I. B. Kirk | Howard E. Carson 3 C | J. B. Denithorne 3 E | Frank P. Pennegar 3 C | Charles V. Peace 3 C | |
| Coffeyville, Kans. | Ray L. DeHon 1 C | | Harriett Holloway 12 M | J. D. Byers 2 C | J. K. Clay 2 M | J. D. Byers 2 |
| Cohoes, N. Y. | William R. Higgins 1 M | (Board of 2) E | Alfred F. Bennett 1 M | | E. M. Bell 1 M | James E. Mullen 1 M |
| Collingswood, N. J. | R. J. Mattern 2 E | (Board of 3) C | E. P. Robinson 1 C | | Samuel W. Mead 1‡ | |
| Colorado Springs, Colo. | Louise Huff 6 C$^a$ | | A. N. Wyman 5 C | E. L. Mosley 5 C | O. R. Gillett 26 A | |
| Columbia, Mo. | | W. E. Points 2 E | L. H. Sapp 2 E | | W. A. Norris 1 M | O. W. Boutwell 1 B |
| Columbia, Pa. | | | | | George M. Bodenhauser | |
| Columbia, S. C. | | | B. E. Abrams 4 C | | P. E. Payne 5 E | |
| Columbus, Ga. | W. N. Hays 8 A | (Board of 3) C | Miss M. M. Affleck 13 A | Marshall Morton 2 C | W. E. Mayher 3 A | |
| Columbus, Miss. | | D. C. Nickles* C | T. W. Lewis, Jr. 6 C | | C. E. Lehmberg | |
| Columbus, Ohio | Samuel J. Willis* E$^a$ | | D. S. Creamer 5 C | Lee S. Gaty 2 M | Nelson Dysart 5 B | Charles F. Lender |
| Compton, Calif. | Otis K. Reifsnyder 7 A$^c$ | Blanche Firkins | Roy L. O. Adams 3 E | Albert B. Gidley 4 C | F. E. Estes | |
| Concord, N. H. | Arthur E. Roby C$^a$ | (Board of 3) | Carl H. Foster C | | Travis P. Burroughs E | Arthur E. Roby C |
| Concord, N. C. | | | B. E. Harris 10 C | B. E. Harris 10 C | D. G. Caldwell 8 B | |
| Connellsville, Pa. | Ira D. Younkin 2 E | J. W. Goldsmith 2 C | C. K. McKesson 3 E | Ira D. Younkin 2 E | D. E. Minerd 1 B | |
| Connersville, Ind. | | | | | H. W. Smelser 4 M | |
| Conshohocken, Pa. | Francis L. Frear 3 C | William DeHaven 10 E | David M. Hayes 12 C | Joseph J. Quinn | Thomas S. White C | William H. Longacre 2 C |
| Coraopolis, Pa. | Harry Kennedy 1 C | (County) C | E. C. Harper 1 C | W. E. Cain 10 C | D. K. Clever 1 B | (County) |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corning, N. Y. | | Frank H. Suits 8 M | Chester R. Hallock 2 E | | H. E. Elwood 9 B | A. Maltby 2 M |
| Corpus Christi, Tex. | A. C. McCaughan 2 E | G. E. Meisenheimer 2 C | Burton Dunn 10 C | R. L. Willis 2 C | N. D. Carter 2 C | |
| Corsicana, Tex. | | J. M. Pugh 4 E | J. N. Garitty M | | William T. Shell, Jr. M | |
| Cortland, N. Y. | A. A. Somers 1 E | C. L. Green 18 E | A. A. Somers 1 E | | Ira L. Garner B | Stella Nichols 15 M |
| Coshocton, Ohio | Ella Williams$^a$ | | | | D. M. Criswell | |
| Council Bluffs, Iowa | Arthur G. Larsen 5 E$^a$ | J. V. Crowe 3 E | Charles W. Gould 3 E | | J. M. Moskovitz 1 M | |
| Covington, Ky. | H. W. Percival 3 A | E. H. Chapman 5 A | H. W. Percival 3 A | W. H. Ritte 1 A | Theodore Salee 1 A | |
| Cranston, R. I. | Charles H. Arnold 18 C$^a$ | (Board of 3) C | William M. Lee 25 E | Harry L. Schofield 4 C | Daniel S. Latham 20 C | John A. Hamilton 25 E |
| Crawfordsville, Ind. | | | Clark Jones 4 E | | F. N. Daugherty 4 M | |
| Cudahy, Wis. | | Edward C. Petri 8‡ | Edward L. Stringer 4 E | Joseph Wagner 4 E | S. H. Kast 2‡ | |
| Cumberland, Md. | Harry Irvine 1 E | | Harry Irvine 1 E | | Harvey H. Weiss | |
| Cumberland, R. I. | William F. Casey C$^a$ | (Board of 3) E | Thomas Dwan E | | James J. Sheridan 2 C | |
| Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio | J. E. Preston 5 E$^a$ | | M. E. Brown 10 E | | R. H. Markwith 8 B | |
| Dallas, Tex. | John N. Edy 4 C | L. L. Bristol 11 A | F. F. Florence 6 C | B. P. Dysart 3 A | J. W. Bass 4 A | Mrs. A. Walker 13 A |
| Danbury, Conn. | S. B. Treadwell 8 E | George Allingham 2 B | S. B. Treadwell 8 E | J. A. Deakin 4 E | James F. Young C | |
| Danvers, Mass. | William B. Sullivan M | (Board of 3) E | A. Preston Chase E | | Hugo Nappe B | Grace Towne B |
| Danville, Ill. | | Mayme Seymour 4 E | J. A. Wherry 4 M | J. F. VanAllen 4 M | F. R. Brubaker 4 E | F. R. Brubaker 4 E |
| Danville, Va. | C. B. Strange 9 C | P. G. Ragland 14 E | E. H. Marshall 8 E | B. A. Pollock 8 C | R. W. Garnett 16 C | R. W. Garnett 16 C |
| Davenport, Iowa | | Charles Hild 3 E | Clarence Smith 1 E | Harry Parker 1 M | George Braunlich 1 B | Walter Clasen 14‡ |
| Dayton, Ohio | E. E. Hagerman 11 A | | W. W. Dieterich 9 A | H. A. Maltby 5 A | A. O. Peters 16 A | E. V. Stoecklein 14 A |
| Daytona Beach, Fla. | F. R. Mills 2 C | F. R. Mills 2 C | S. M. Leidy 1 C | M. S. Couch 2 C | Simon Reed 1 A | |
| Dearborn, Mich. | L. E. Maples 11 M$^c$ | (Board of 3) M | Wm. A. Kaiser 7 E | Earl L. Coleman 1 M | C. A. Christensen 13 M | Wm. C. Dumire 3 M |
| Decatur, Ala. | | | J. S. Wyatt* C | | Lee Roy Murphree | |
| Decatur, Ga. | | (Board of 3) C | (Bank) | A. F. Newman | H. H. Allen*‡ | George S. Swords |
| Decatur, Ill. | W. E. Rugh 4 E | | E. A. Mayes 4‡ | | W. M. Talbert 3‡ | |
| Dedham, Mass. | William F. Whitman C | (Board of 3) | John T. Gaynor E | | Thomas J. Breman | (Board of 3) E |
| Del Rio, Tex. | E. F. Howard 1 C | E. F. Howard 1 C | E. F. Howard 1 C | | D. A. York 1 C | |
| Denison, Tex. | Clarence Scott 6 E | W. P. Lebrecht 1 M | H. Etter 12 M | | W. A. Lee 6 M | |
| Denver, Colo. | | Wm. F. McGlone 4 M | Wm. F. McGlone 4 M | Allen S. Fogg 4 M | Fred W. Bailey 4 M | Fred W. Bailey 4 M |
| Derby, Conn. | | Charles Marvin 6 M | Henry T. Waters E | | Thomas F. Plunkett 12 M | Frank J. Buckley 6 M |
| Des Moines, Iowa | Roy C. Welch 1 E | C. C. Cook 1 B | E. C. Powers 12‡ | Garry C. Hunter 1‡ | Tom Hardiman | |
| Detroit, Mich. | William J. Curran 2 M$^c$ | (Board of 4) M | Chas. L. Williams 7 E | John J. Gorman 4 M | Henry F. Vaughn 15 B | John Bellinger 4 B |
| Dickson City, Pa. | | | | | Joseph S. Kalwaytis | |
| Dodge City, Kans. | S. P. Reynolds 2 E | | C. E. Smith 12 C | | C. E. McCarty 1 C | |
| Donora, Pa. | W. B. Cushing 2 E | Joe P. Schmidt 4 E | E. C. Hartung 6 C | | Herman Lang 6 C | Cora Vernon 10 C |
| Dormont, Pa. | William N. Neel 4 C | | William N. Neel 4 C | Harold L. Cloud 5 C | Frederick Frank 1 B | |
| Dothan, Ala. | | | J. L. Vaughn 6 C | (Board 3) E | F. G. Granger 6 B | |
| Dover, N. H. | T. J. Chesley | | Margaret M. Gorman 1 C | | Wm. E. Whiteley 15 C | Charles E. Cronin 1 C |
| Dover, N. J. | Peter C. Buck 9 C | Sam. J. Gibson | Peter C. Buck | Joseph V. Baker 3 B | John G. Taylor 25 B | |
| Du Bois, Pa. | P. J. Swift 1 E | W. A. Bennett 3 C | D. R. Vasbinder 2 C | P. J. Swift 1 E | J. I. Brockbank 3 C | W. H. Hoover 1 E |
| Dubuque, Iowa | Fred Gantert 16 A$^a$ | George Bennett 15 C | Otto F. Puls 13 A | A. E. Sigman 12 A | W. J. Connell 6 A | |
| Duluth, Minn. | C. A. Williams 6 E | J. A. Scott 22 C | A. C. Gilbert 1‡ | F. W. Johnson 7 C | M. Mc. Fisher 4‡ | S. F. Snively 14 E |
| Dunkirk, N. Y. | | (Board of 2) E | F. J. Janice 7 E | | Edgar Bieber* B | |
| Dunmore, Pa. | William T. Taylor$^c$ | | Edward Dougherty E | | Wm. Ferresse C | |
| Duquesne, Pa. | Edward H. Fey 6 E | J. E. Ridall 10 C | John C. Meighen 15 E | | H. J. Bowen 2 C | M. H. Kowallis 3 E |
| Durham, N. C. | C. J. Jones 5 C | | C. B. Alston 14 C | A. T. Crutchfield 12 C | J. H. Epperson 20 B | W. E. Stanley 14 B |

### Table VIII-B.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Chief Finance Officer | City Assessor | City Treasurer | Purchasing Agent | Health Officer | Director of Public Welfare |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| East Chicago, Ind. | M. A. McCormick* M[c] | | Roy Clark* E | | David Johns* M | |
| East Cleveland, Ohio | Grant T. Apthorp* C | | Grant T. Apthorp* C | R. D. Eicher 9 A | James McCauley 26 A | Margaret Brown 1 A |
| Easthampton, Mass. | William A. Walker C | Thomas F. Lynn 12 E | Nora M. Conners 2 E | | C. C. Buckner 18 B | (Selectmen) |
| East Hartford, Conn. | (Finance Board) M | (Board of 3) E | George F. Campbell 4 E | C. H. Olmsted 4 M | F. W. Brecker 4 B | E. Wardle 4 M |
| East Liverpool, Ohio | Shelton J. Overdorf[a] | | Olen H. Dawson 1 E | E. B. Laughlin 1 M | Dan McKeener | E. B. Laughlin 1 M |
| East Moline, Ill. | Jerome Vogler 2 E | | Henry Nagle 2 E | | J. H. Fowler 6 M | |
| Easton, Pa. | F. T. Clark 2 E | R. Rogers 21 C | W. M. Heiberger 3 E | | J. S. Cohen 3 C | Frederick C. Roberts 3 |
| East Orange, N. J. | Francis Gilbert 16 M[a] | (Board of 5) M | W. A. Clapp 11 M | | Frank J. Osborne 10 B | Grace E. Colvin |
| East Providence, R. I. | | (Board of 3) E | George M. Hull | | William H. T. Hamill C | John F. Newman 3 C |
| East St. Louis, Ill. | John T. Connors 4 E | | T. E. Krebs 12 C | | A. P. Lauman 12 E | James F. Crow 2 |
| Eau Claire, Wis. | J. C. Tennessey[c] | G. A. Hackett 4 C | F. W. Froeling 25 C | | L. H. Flynn 5 B | |
| Ecorse, Mich. | S. J. Winterhalter 6 C | Thomas Weber 1 E | Paul Volmar 2 E | | Dr. Van Benleare C | Lee Hilman |
| El Dorado, Ark. | C. H. Murphy‡ | | Buell H. Hammond E | | F. O. Mahoney‡ | |
| El Dorado, Kans. | | | F. H. Cron 4‡ | F. E. Schide 4‡ | F. A. Loman 1‡ | |
| Elgin, Ill. | M. H. Brightman 4 E | | Esther Gerber 4 C | | A. L. Mann 4 C | M. M. Lehman 4 E |
| Elizabeth, N. J. | J. A. Mitchell[c] | (Board of 13) E | C. J. Crowley* | | L. J. Richards | N. Weltchek |
| Elizabeth City, N. C. | J. J. Hughes 10 C | | (Bank) 4 C | | I. A. Ward 4 C | A. H. Outlaw 8 E |
| Elkhart, Ind. | G. W. Anderson* M[c] | | Frank H. Ellis E | | A. W. Kistner M | |
| Ellwood City, Pa. | A. J. Howell 1 E | (Board of 5) E | H. D. Maxwell 1 C | Lowell W. Monroe 7 C | Lewis Young 9 C | C. Elizabeth Sowry 7 |
| Elmhurst, Ill. | | | Frank J. Maier 2 E | | A. L. Mathis 2 M | |
| Elmira, N. Y. | Eleanor F. Conevery 1 A | Martin T. Purtell 10 A | | Florence J. Sullivan | R. B. Howland 20 B | Florence J. Sullivan 1 C |
| Elmwood Park, Ill. | (Finance Committee) | | Steve Merril* C | | Laura Arney 7 C | |
| El Paso, Tex. | G. R. Daniels 8 M[a] | J. E. Anderson 8 E | D. F. Sullivan 19 E | G. B. Davis 8 M | T. J. McCamant 1 M | W. E. Casteel 4 E |
| Elwood, Ind. | | | Cal H. Long* E | | M. Hoppenrath* M | |
| Elyria, Ohio | Alec Schilleman 12 E | | Jack Marshall 2 E | Fred Underhill 4 M | G. E. French 30 B | |
| Emporia, Kans. | Carl Brogan 2 E | | E. H. Wade 11 C | | C. H. Munger C | |
| Endicott, N. Y. | | G. H. Nichols 15 B | David T. Lewis 15 B | | M. W. Welch 4 B | Hubert Osterhout B |
| Englewood, N. J. | Charles Aery 1 C[a] | (Board of 3) C | Byron P. Barstow 18 C | T. J. Ahrens 5 E | H. R. H. Nicholas 2 B | C. N. Dezer, Jr. E |
| Enid, Okla. | Louis S. Morell 2 E | | Richard H. Bell 2 E | | R. C. Baker | |
| Erie, Pa. | Thomas Mehaffey 14 E | A. J. Sterrett 1 C | John J. Phillips 3 E | | James R. Smith 7 C | James P. Rossiter 3 E |
| Escanaba, Mich. | E. E. Petersen 3 A[a] | Carl E. Anderson 9 C | A. J. Manley 12 A | T. F. Kessler 9 C | H. J. Defnet 16 A | F. F. Davis 2 A |
| Euclid, Ohio | W. B. Gilson 4 E[a] | | W. B. Verbsky 10 E | | Robert Lockhart | |
| Eugene, Ore. | | | Fred Wentworth 15 E | C. M. Bryan* E | R. C. Romig 3 M | |
| Eureka, Calif. | A. W. Kildale 15 E | Daniel Matheson 28 E | Eleanor E. Borg 3 E | | W. J. Quinn 6 M | |
| Evanston, Ill. | H. S. Simpson 4 C | Nathan I. Noach‡ | S. H. Gilbert 2 E | A. W. Handford 10 M | J. W. H. Pollard 9 M | |
| Evansville, Ind. | Gilbert H. Bosse 1 M[c] | | Edwin F. Diekmann 1 E | G. H. Bosse 1 M | Thomas F. Reitz 1 M | |
| Everett, Mass. | Richard Darby[a] | Henry Roche 1 | William E. Emerton 11 | | John A. Brewin 15 | Wm. J. Brickley, Jr.* |
| Everett, Wash. | H. Arends 3 C | | Frank A. Turner 3 C | H. Arends 3 C | I. W. Parsons 3 B | C. E. Costello 3 E |
| Fairfield, Ala. | | | C. D. Sallade 2 E | C. D. Sallade 2 E | J. T. Duncan 10 C | |
| Fairhaven, Mass. | Claudia I. Schiller[a] | (Board of 3) E | | | William F. Delano 10 E | F. E. Brown 3 E |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fairmont, W. Va. | Paul E. Amos 8 E | (County) | Paul E. Amos 8 E | | G. W. Swiger 10 B | A. C. West 1 |
| Fall River, Mass. | Ernest A. Floyd B$^{a}$ | James Griffiths B | Eugene J. Cote B | John Connolly M | Ernest M. Morris B | F. W. Harrison B |
| Fargo, N. D. | Fred O. Olsen 2 C | M. G. Hagen 3 C | George T. Standish 8 C | | B. K. Kilbourne 8 C | |
| Faribault, Minn. | | A. E. Hutchinson 7 C | Louise Thonet 14 C | L. E. Zuehlke 4 C | F. U. Davis 12 C | |
| Farrell, Pa. | Lewis Levine 3 M | John Law 3 C | J. F. Kaliney 3 C | Michael Nevant 3 E | Ben Davis 3 C | |
| Fayetteville, N. C. | J. F. Burgess C | | Sallie W. Tomlinson 8 C | Rupert Harrison 2 C | T. M. Foster | |
| Ferndale, Mich. | | R. F. Goodspeed 4 A | R. J. Bingham 11 A | Jay F. Gibbs 5 C | W. G. Beattie 4 A | |
| Findlay, Ohio | Charles E. Simpson 2 E$^{a}$ | | Guy Davis 2 E | | Martha Laffey 4 B | S. E. Frost 4 M |
| Fitchburg, Mass. | J. B. Perault 7 M$^{a}$ | (Board of 3) M | John B. Fellows 7 M | | Fred Brigham 19 M | Patricia Donahoe 2 M |
| Flint, Mich. | Olney L. Craft 4 C | Mark E. Older 2‡ | Dexter G. Conklin 9‡ | Ned J. Vermilya A | Kenneth Moore 1 A | V. S. Woodward 2 B |
| Floral Park, N. Y. | | Charles Hartman 6 C | Edward C. Ullmann 20 B | Charles Hartman 2 C | A. E. Goldfarb C | |
| Florence, Ala. | | | | | W. D. Hubbard | |
| Florence, S. C. | | (Board)‡ | A. McTaggart 13 C | D. G. Adams 2 C | George D. Heath 8 B | |
| Fond du Lac, Wis. | G. W. Ackerman Co. 6$^{a}$ | Nick Entringer 2 C | Otto Muenter 18 C | | M. O. Boudry 2 C | |
| Forest Park, Ill. | Otto Reich 4 E | | Ernest H. Witt 4 C | | William C. Masslow 8 C | |
| Fort Collins, Colo. | | | Earl Douglass 1 E | | T. C. Taylor 15 C | |
| Fort Dodge, Iowa | O. W. Sundberg 2 C | Iver Linder 10 C | E. H. Zuerrer 25 C | | T. N. Riordan 2 C | Frank Pence 2 B |
| Fort Madison, Iowa | L. F. Albers 18 C | A. G. Perks 6 E | Margaret Jaeger 4 E | L. F. Albers 18 C | H. F. Noble 8 M | |
| Fort Scott, Kans. | John T. Crain 2 E | | D. G. Cobb 2 C | | Fred Howell 2 C | |
| Fort Smith, Ark. | Frances T. Buck 2 E | | Frances T. Buck 2 E | | J. E. Johnson B | Frances T. Buck 2 E |
| Fort Thomas, Ky. | P. D. Williams 1 E | William Putnam 3 C | Carl J. Haack 5 C | | F. H. Southgate 15 C | |
| Fort Wayne, Ind. | Louis F. Crosby* M | Lawrence Hoeltje* E | C. H. Borgman* E | Arthur E. Smith | Carl C. Eberly* M | Elmer Fox |
| Fort Worth, Tex. | George D. Fairtrace 4 C | W. T. Macy 10 A | Henry Keller 3 C | Grover Cline 14 A | A. H. Flickwir 6 A | A. H. Flickwir 6 A |
| Fostoria, Ohio | Gerald D. King 3 E$^{a}$ | | Margaret Fink 1 | Charles A. Latshaw 3 M | L. W. Gibson 4 B | Charles A. Latshaw 3 M |
| Framingham, Mass. | George J. Sullivan C | Roger H. O'Brien C | John P. Dunn E | | David Moxon B | Oscar W. Clapp E |
| Frankfort, Ind. | | | C. V. Chittick E | R. A. Allen M | Milton McCarty M | |
| Frankfort, Ky. | Edward Freeman | F. C. Hutchison 1 C | Edward Freeman 1 C | | R. M. Coblin 1 C | |
| Franklin, Pa. | J. L. Harrison 5 E | V. W. Sayers 6 C | E. H. Cribbs 7 E | J. L. Harrison 5 E | C. H. Brown 20 C | |
| Frederick, Md. | | | L. E. Eichelberger 1 E | (Board of 3) | E. C. Kefauver 11 M | |
| Freeport, Ill. | J. H. Rosenstrel 2 E | Oscar Rotzler 8 E | Elizabeth Erwin 2 E | | K. B. Rieger 2 M | |
| Freeport, N. Y. | | August Petry 8 B | Stephen W. Hunt 10 B | H. E. Pearsall 2 B | William H. Runcie 10 B | |
| Fremont, Nebr. | F. D. Drew | | A. F. Plambeck 21 E | Joe Ashenbrenner 6 E | J. S. Drvries | |
| Fremont, Ohio | Carroll E. Cox 1 E$^{a}$ | | O. L. Immel 1 E | | E. L. Vermilya 25 B | |
| Fresno, Calif. | William Glass 10 E | G. P. Cummings 20 E | Scott K. Wood* E | William Glass 10 E | C. Mathewson 18 M | Z. S. Leymel 6 E |
| Fullerton, Calif. | | (County) | J. Charles Johnson 3 E | F. C. Hezmalhalch 18 E | K. H. Sutherland | |
| Fulton, N. Y. | H. A. Fielding 1 M | C. H. Hulett 15‡ | | | L. A. Simpson 1 M | F. S. Spangle 1 M |
| Gadsden, Ala. | J. H. Meighan 4 C | | D. C. Wadsworth 4 C | H. C. Thomas 4 C | C. L. Murphree 4 C | Bess Adams 4‡ |
| Gainesville, Fla. | Clarence A. O'Neill | Sam Harn 4‡ | Clarence O'Neil 4 C | G. H. Cairns 6 C | W. Lassiter 15 A | |
| Galesburg, Ill. | | Axel Carlson 12 E | Alfred Nystrom 2 E | | Fred Giddings 8‡ | |
| Galveston, Tex. | F. A. Quin C$^{a}$ | W. R. Willard E | R. Lee Kempner C | Thomas B. Niland C | Walter Kleberg C | |
| Gardner, Mass. | J. Myron Moore 12 C$^{a}$ | Jaddus V. Leger 12 M | Frank B. Edgell 12 C | | Wm. P. O'Donnell 12 B | M. E. S. Anderholm 12M |
| Garfield, N. J. | Walter Wolchko 1 M | (Board of 3) M | | | Charles Bleasby 20 B | |
| Garfield Hgts., Ohio | E. H. Malone 3 E$^{a}$ | | John L. Hlavin 3 E | | Robert Lockhart | |
| Gary, Ind. | Ray Madden* M$^{c}$ | J. V. Costello 4 E | Clyde Hart* E | H. J. Goehegan 5 | Walter M. Behn | |
| Gastonia, N. C. | J. L. Kendrick | | Guy C. Killian 4 C | H. Rutter 5 | Mc. G. Anders 8 A | Mable Potts 8 A |
| Geneva, N. Y. | | F. LaPiointe 3 M | J. H. Brown 3 E | H. T. Maxwell 5 | C. W. Grove 15 B | Carl Goodyear 3‡ |

## Table VIII-B.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Chief Finance Officer | City Assessor | City Treasurer | Purchasing Agent | Health Officer | Director of Public Welfare |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Glen Cove, N. Y. | Sterling W. Mudge 8 E | L. B. Hammond 1 M | Sterling W. Mudge 8 E | Harvey Doxey 1 E | J. B. Conolly 16 M | Fred E. Bond 1 E |
| Glendale, Calif. | A. H. Haak 1 A$^{c}$ |  | Blanche H. Gartley 6 E | F. E. Dickson 13 A | F. A. Wilmot | Louise W. Douglas 2 A |
| Glens Falls, N. Y. | N. C. Reardon 1‡ | George Lasher 10‡ | N. C. Reardon 1‡ | Irving Griffing E | V. D. Selleck 5 B | H. F. Lee 1 M |
| Gloucester, Mass. | Kenneth S. Webber 4 C$^{a}$ | Frank A. Rogers 15 C | J. R. Bohan 1 C |  | Patrick H. Curley 10 B | Jeremiah Foster 4 C |
| Gloucester, N. J. |  | (Board of 3) M | J. H. Johnson 3 M | Daniel Lane 2 M | J. A. Beek 8 B |  |
| Gloversville, N. Y. |  | Bertha B. Eaton 10 C | E. A. James 30 E |  | A. L. Johnson 22 M | Herbert L. Montanye 4 E |
| Goldsboro, N. C. | Z. G. Hollowell 8 C |  | J. G. Spence 12 C | Z. G. Hollowell 8 C | G. F. Reeves 2 B |  |
| Goshen, Ind. | Ray M. Kitson* E |  |  |  | G. A. Whippy 5 M | C. E. Firestone |
| Grand Forks, N. D. | Charles J. Evanson 18$^{a}$ | Henry Brenna 8‡ | O. J. Heen 1‡ |  | J. M. Hofto 1‡ |  |
| Grand Island, Nebr. | Carl Hehnke |  | J. R. Geddes 2 E |  | J. G. Woodin 8 M |  |
| Grand Junction, Colo. |  |  | William L. Sackett 8 C | J. P. Soderstrum 5 | E. H. Munro 13 A |  |
| Grand Rapids, Mich. | B. J. Green 6‡$^{a}$ | (Board of 3) C | Frank V. Smith 8 C | James A. Kinney 18 A | A. H. Edwards 5‡ | C. Sophus Johnson 1 C |
| Granite City, Ill. | Carroll Bright 4 M$^{c}$ | Ray Odum 2 E | H. C. Hecht 2 E | Carroll Bright 4 M | A. M. Jennings 2 E |  |
| Great Falls, Mont. |  | (County) | T. L. Ashton 2 E | W. H. Harrison 15 M | F. L. Watkins‡ |  |
| Greeley, Colo. | L. B. Carrel 18 E |  | Lena Pleak 32 E | W. H. Welsh 4 C | W. A. Schoen 2 C |  |
| Green Bay, Wis. | John Tease 6 C | James Beth 2 C | John Tease 6 C | John Tease 6 C | H. S. Atkinson C |  |
| Greenfield, Mass. | J. C. O'Brien 3‡ | (Board of 3) E | B. J. Michelman 1 E | Morton H. Nichols 1 C | George P. Moore | (Board of 3) E |
| Greensboro, N. C. | C. H. Porterfield 9 A$^{a}$ |  | G. C. Eichhorn 4 C | G. C. Eichhorn 10 A | C. C. Hudson 10 A | Ethel Speas |
| Greensburg, Pa. | John Barclay, Jr. 5 E | Joseph B. Cherry 6 C | David E. Crock 8 E | John Barclay, Jr. 5 C | Joseph B. Cherry 1 C |  |
| Greenville, Miss. | O. Norton 10 C | Clive Metcalfe 3 C | R. D. Berch 20 C |  | John W. Shackleford 8 C | Mrs. N. Boyette*‡ |
| Greenville, S. C. | C. F. McCullough 3 E | (Board) | B. F. Dillard 2 C |  | I. S. Barksdale 10 B |  |
| Greenville, Tex. |  | John M. Boles 2 E | B. R. Brown C |  | B. F. Arnold 8 C |  |
| Greenwood, Miss. | G. L. Ray* E | Bonner Duggan 7 M |  |  | L. A. Barnett 6 B | Mrs. George Beall*‡ |
| Greenwood, S. C. |  |  | Robert Cartledge, Jr. |  | Joseph E. Brodie |  |
| Griffin, Ga. |  |  | H. P. Powell 2 C | R. A. Drake 2 C | W. C. Humphreys 8 B |  |
| Grosse Pte Park, Mich. |  | John F. DeYonker 7 M | Chas. D. Heise, Jr. 10 M |  | Benjamin H. Warren | (County) |
| Gulfport, Miss. | Ivan Ballenger 2 E | J. W. Milner | Ivan Ballenger |  | Daniel J. Williams |  |
| Hackensack, N. J. | Robt. Featherstone 2 C$^{a}$ | F. C. Koehler 8 C | William J. Eck 2 C |  | L. Van D. Chandler 10A |  |
| Hagerstown, Md. |  |  | Charles E. Fry 2 M |  | W. R. Cameron 6 M |  |
| Hamilton, Ohio | Mark C. Thomas* A |  | Mayme Elble 4‡ | William J. Welsh 5‡ | C. J. Baldridge 6 A | R. P. Price 6 |
| Hammond, Ind. | G. Bertram Smith 4 M$^{c}$ |  |  | G. Bertram Smith 4 M | H. G. Cole 4 M |  |
| Hamtramck, Mich. | F. S. Sosnowski 1 M$^{c}$ | L. A. Dysarz 1 M | John Anger 3 E | Frank Bagnowski 1 C | P. E. Boliwicki 1 M | John J. Matkowski 1 M |
| Hannibal, Mo. | B. Baxter Bond | S. J. McIntyre 16 C |  | R. W. Isbister 2 C | E. M. Lucke 10 C |  |
| Hanover, Pa. |  |  | H. C. Thoman 10 C |  | Howard P. Knapper* C | C. A. Eckbert 8 C |
| Harlingen, Tex. | J. J. Burk 1 M | D. D. Norton 3 M | D. D. Norton 6 M | Sam Botts 5 C | V. M. Bass 3 M |  |
| Harrisburg, Ill. | C. A. Sloan 11 E |  | Arthur Wilson 11 C |  | Charles Walden 4 C |  |
| Harrisburg, Pa. | Charles W. Burtnett 17 E | James C. Thompson 19C | John A. F. Hall 2 E |  | John M. J. Raunick 23 C |  |
| Harrison, N. J. | Bernard P. Walsh 25 M | Edward A. Riordan 4 M | Bernard P. Walsh 25 M |  | John T. McClure 25 B |  |
| Hartford, Conn. | Edwin E. Lamb$^{c}$ | (Board of 3) M | George H. Gabb 8 E |  | C. P. Botsford 28 C | William J. Ryan 4 C |
| Harvey, Ill. | J. W. Chapman 4 E |  | A. F. Waldschmidt 4 M | J. W. Chapman 4 E | M. R. Morse 8‡ |  |
| Hastings, Nebr. | Charles Mousel 2 M | (County) | Helen Weiler 6 E |  | E. J. Latta 2 M |  |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hattiesburg, Miss. | | | | | B. D. Blackwelder | |
| Haverhill, Mass. | Arthur E. Leach 35 C$^a$ | Fred L. Bennett 19 C | Arthur T. Jacobs 32 C | William W. Savage | Fred W. Morse* B | C. Archie Horne 2 B |
| Hawthorne, N. J. | Arthur Rhodes | | | | William Missouellie | |
| Hazleton, Pa. | C. B. Bittenbender 20 E | W. C. Kerbaugh 16 C | Frederick Walser 3 E | | William Pfaff 5 C | |
| Helena, Mont. | | | H. J. Ruegg 3 C | | C. F. Trump* C | |
| Hempstead, N. Y. | | Harry F. DeBeau 7 C | Lael VonElm 1 C | | Smith A. Combes 10 C | |
| Henderson, Ky. | George A. Vogel 1 E | F. S. Haag 1 C | Oscar Baskett 1 C | | J. L. Tanner 1‡ | L. L. Hurley 1 E |
| Herkimer, N. Y. | | | | | James W. Graves | |
| Hibbing, Minn. | A. B. Timmerman E | Russell Barrett E | Walter Johnson C | C. C. Counts C | C. N. Harris C | J. R. Bresnahan C |
| Highland Park, Ill. | Lyle Gourley 4 E | | Charles F. Grant 8 C | V. C. Musser 8 C | Donald Rossiter 4 C | |
| Highland Park, Mich. | Lilias F. Evans 14 E | George L. Voorhis 18 E | Robert M. Smith 22 E | Lilias F. Evans 2 C | William N. Braley 15 C | Vera Nolan 1‡ |
| High Point, N. C. | E. M. Knox 7 C | | Lois Welborn 4 C | Lois Welborn 8 A | W. J. McAnally 4 A | Euzelia Smart |
| Hoboken, N. J. | William H. Gilfert 9 C | (Board of 5) | Wm. H. Gilfert 9 E | | Joseph Stack 17 C | Bernard N. McFeely 9 E |
| Holland, Mich. | Henry Prins 6 E | Peter VanArk 6 E | John Steggerda 1 E | | William Westrote 5 C | |
| Holyoke, Mass. | Daniel W. Kenney 28$^a$ | (Board of 3) C | Lionel Bonvouloir 2 E | | Daniel P. Hartnett 4 B | (Board of 3) C |
| Homestead, Pa. | | | George Wilson 1 C | Harry Markley | M. D. Weis 20 C | |
| Hopewell, Va. | D. L. Elder 4 C | | Hugh T. Birchett 8 E | W. Guy Ancell 1 C | L. A. Sims 18 A | Elizabeth Pirkle 2 A |
| Hopkinsville, Ky. | S. L. Peace 5 C | W. H. Dillman 6 C | | S. L. Peace 5 C | Phil Hayne 8 B | S. L. Peace 2 |
| Hoquiam, Wash. | | | Madge S. Peterson 8 E | | H. C. Watkins* M | |
| Hornell, N. Y. | Howard P. Babcock 4 E | William Jeffery 6 E | Howard P. Babcock 6 E | Ernest G. Stewart 3‡ | George E. Taylor 8‡ | Milo W. Waldorf 1 E |
| Hot Springs, Ark. | Emmett Jackson 1 E | | W. W. Ermey 8 E | Leo P. McLaughlin 8 E | J. F. Merritt 10 M | |
| Houston, Tex. | Harry A. Giles 18 E$^c$ | T. W. Browne 22 M | Wm. A. Bernrieder 2 M | George Eddy 2 M | Geo. W. Larendon 2 M | |
| Hudson, N. Y. | | (Board of 3) M | M. William Herbs 3 E | | Louis Van Joesen | |
| Huntington, Ind. | Wallace Reed* E | R. G. Mitchell* E | Wallace Reed* E | | R. F. Frost 15 M | |
| Huntington, W. Va. | E. M. Huffman 7 M$^a$ | | I. J. Harshbarger E | Martin V. Chapman* E | G. A. Ratcliff 1 M | |
| Huntington Park, Calif. | William H. Boss 11 E$^a$ | | William H. Boss 11 E | William Y. Bellert 3 C | William T. Salvin 3 C | |
| Huntsville, Ala. | N. M. Payne C | | N. M. Payne C | | W. C. Hatchett 10 B | |
| Huron, S. D. | M. F. Walt$^a$ | William R. Joy 3 B | William R. Olson 15 B | | T. J. Wood 1 B | |
| Hutchinson, Kans. | W. B. Hoagland 4 E | | May D. Harsha 2 M | | L. B. March 2 M | |
| Independence, Kans. | W. C. Cavert 6 E | | Chester E. Ditch 9 C | | S. Flatt 5 C | |
| Independence, Mo. | Frank B. Hamilton 9 M$^a$ | W. W. Peacock 7 E | L. Y. Cunningham 14 E | | F. L. Cook 11 M | |
| Indianapolis, Ind. | Walter Boettcher* M$^c$ | | William Clauer* E | Albert Losche 5 M | Herman G. Morgan 22 B | |
| Inglewood, Calif. | Otto H. Duelke 13 E$^a$ | (County) | Eula A. Spaulding* E | | J. L. Pomeroy | |
| Iowa City, Iowa | | William J. White 16 E | E. B. Raymond 8 E | | I. A. Rankin 2 M | |
| Irondequoit, N. Y. | Thomas E. Broderick 8 | John Gohey 1 B | Thos. E. Broderick 8 | Fred E. Hussey 1 B | W. W. Bradstreet 8 B | George D. Bryant |
| Iron Mountain, Mich. | Joseph A. Michela 9 C | A. P. Farell 6 M | John Trottier 7 E | Joseph A. Michela 9 C | L. J. Browning 2 M | |
| Ironton, Ohio | R. F. Mittendorf 1 C$^a$ | | A. T. Turnbull 10 C | | H. S. Allen 5 B | A. R. N. Truelson 2 |
| Ironwood, Mich. | Leo Adriansen 9 A | James Goudie 2 C | William Pollari 9 C | Dow I. Sears 6 | C. C. Urghart 3 A | |
| Irvington, N. J. | H. Kruttschnitt 4 E | H. Kruttschnitt 4 E | I. Greenfield 4‡ | Paul Merz 1 C | William Bailey 4 M | P. A. Miller, Jr. 4 E |
| Ithaca, N. Y. | J. E. Matthews 10 B | L. E. Dofflemyer 9 M | C. A. Snyder 14 M | | L. T. Genung 13 B | John Post 2 B |
| Jackson, Mich. | | C. P. Ismon 10 M | H. A. Hirschman 18 E | Philip Campbell 8 C | Floyd Town 12 A | Alan Leancy 2 |
| Jackson, Miss. | D. W. McGehee 3 C$^a$ | T. W. Chandler 13 C | | A. J. Johnson 15 C | W. E. Noblin B | |
| Jackson, Tenn. | Lawrence Taylor 16 E | P. J. Phillips 2 E | R. E. Franklin 8 E | Lawrence Taylor 16 E | Herman Hawkin 8 C | J. D. Johnson 10 E |
| Jacksonville, Fla. | J. E. Pace 14 C$^a$ | John L. Hall 21 E | C. W. Hendley 1 E | G. M. Gordon 24 C | N. A. Upchurch 10 C | |

## TABLE VIII-B.—DIRECTORY OF CITY OFFICIALS IN ALL CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued

| City | Chief Finance Officer | City Assessor | City Treasurer | Purchasing Agent | Health Officer | Director of Public Welfare |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jacksonville, Ill. |  |  | Carl F. Hamilton 2 E |  | Freidrich Engelback **M** |  |
| Jamestown, N. Y. | Floyd C. Moore 1 M | Charles N. Cotter 1 M | Geo. S. Doolittle 7 M | Floyd C. Moore 1 M | William M. Sill 6‡ | Carroll Hall 1 M |
| Janesville, Wis. | M. A. Puerner 11 A | F. A. Smith 20 A | M. A. Puerner 11 A | Henry Traxler 12 C | Fred Welch 15 A | Mary Mitchell 6 A |
| Jeannette, Pa. |  |  | W. J. O'Connell 4 C | J. Claire Manson 7 C | Charles E. Walter 6 C |  |
| Jefferson City, Mo. |  |  |  |  | James G. Bruce |  |
| Jeffersonville, Ind. | John A. Kennedy 4 E | Mildred Badger 4 E | Charles V. Babb 2 |  | Samuel Adair 1 M |  |
| Jersey City, N. J. | Arthur Potterton 1 E | James Tumulty 21 C | Arthur Potterton 1 E | Thomas Hopkins 5 C | James J. Hagen 27 C | Frank Hague 18 E |
| Johnson City, N. Y. | C. R. Nimmons 3 M | C. R. Nimmons 8 M | C. R. Nimmons 8 M |  | R. O. Crosier 12 M |  |
| Johnson City, Tenn. | E. J. Quillen 4 C | (County) |  | E. J. Quillen 4 C | Jack Fleenor 1 B | B. B. Snipes 4 E |
| Johnstown, N. Y. | Edward D. O'Neil 5 E | John H. Mackin 15 E | Edward D. O'Neil 5 E | Clarence Knowles 17 C | G. V. Wilson 6 M | G. V. Wilson 6 M |
| Johnstown, Pa. | Wm. H. Dawson 15 E$^c$ | M. M. Chudy 3 | James N. McKee 3 E | W. I. Hurst 3 | L. W. Jones 21 | Robt. McEldowney 2 |
| Joliet, Ill. | W. H. Lennon | Howard E. Hyde | Frank J. Carnaghi | James Hennessy | L. B. Andrews |  |
| Jonesboro, Ark. |  |  | A. F. Falk 4 E |  | Rufus Shanlever 2 M |  |
| Joplin, Mo. | B. F. Herron 12 E | (County) | B. F. Herron 12 E |  | A. B. Clark‡ | A. B. Clark‡ |
| Kalamazoo, Mich. | Douglas Turnbull 15 A | Wilbur Hunting 3 C | Waldo Bogard 11 A | Harold Bland 13 A | J. L. Lavan 3 C | J. L. Lavan 3 C |
| Kankakee, Ill. | Fred Maisonneuve 1 M | M. W. Baron 2 M | Harold Behan 2 E | Herman Kunde 1 M | J. A. Guertin 2 M |  |
| Kansas City, Kans. | J. O. Spear 23$^a$ | Roy Wheat* | Bertha M. Jagger 16 | R. W. Radford 8 | H. W. Kassel 2 | George H. Long* |
| Kansas City, Mo. | A. L. Darby 5 A | Frank McCabe 3‡ | Maurice Carey 9‡ | William Teefey 9‡ | Jabez N. Jackson 3 A | Wm. E. Sullivan 9 A |
| Kearny, N. J. | James Ness 10 C | (Board of 3) 2C | James Ness 10 C |  | Amos Field 10 B |  |
| Keene, N. H. | W. M. Hubbard 16 M$^a$ | (Board of 3) E | Harold I. Chandler* E |  | Evan C. White* C |  |
| Kenmore, N. Y. |  | John Cheetham 3 C | Thomas W. Dickson 5 E |  | E. R. Lindlater 7 C | (County) |
| Kenosha, Wis. | A. E. Axtell 2 A | (Board of 2) A |  | J. V. Duffy 10 A | G. Windesheim 16 B | (County) |
| Keokuk, Iowa | Harold C. Kiser 3 E | C. E. Langley C | W. A. Logan C | B. F. Earl 3 C | Richard Evans |  |
| Kewanee, Ill. | J. G. Thorne 4 C | W. R. Scott 2 E | C. R. Lory 8 C | J. G. Thorne 4 C | Frank Clark 4 C |  |
| Key West, Fla. | Joseph M. Cabrera 2 E | Samuel B. Pinder 2 E | William T. Archer 4 E | W. M. Albury 5 C$^a$ | Harry C. Galey 6 M |  |
| Kingsport, Tenn. |  | Walker Nelms 2 A | G. D. Black 12 A | F. C. Cloud 12 | F. L. Moore 5 A | F. L. Cloud 12 |
| Kingston, N. Y. | J. H. Craig 2 M | S. W. Moore 2 M | C. Ray Everett 2 M |  | L. E. Sanford 2 B | R. J. Kelder B |
| Kingston, Pa. |  |  | E. M. Rosser 25‡ |  | John F. Seward 10‡ |  |
| Kinston, N. C. | Jasper Skinner |  |  |  | A. L. Hyatt |  |
| Klamath Falls, Ore. | J. J. Keller 2 E |  | Ruth O. Bathiany 6 E | Clifton Richmond 2 E | E. Dietsche‡ |  |
| Knoxville, Tenn. | Harry Wood 3 A | John Boring 6‡ | W. H. Stapleton 7 C | Wiley W. Thomas 11‡ | W. H. Enneis 5‡ | T. H. Haynes 7 A |
| Kokomo, Ind. |  |  | Larry Ryan* E |  | G. C. Matthews* M |  |
| Lackawanna, N. Y. | W. J. Magee 1 C$^a$ | James Sweeney 2 C | John J. Monaghan 2 E | W. J. Magee 1 C | Leo Michalek 2 C |  |
| Laconia, N. H. | Charles F. Ayers$^a$ | J. Grant Quinby | Clarence S. Newell |  | E. J. Gage C | Arthur W. Spring E |
| La Crosse, Wis. | L. J. Kaiser 6$^c$ | Benjamin Stoen 4 E | John P. Roop 8 E |  | A. M. Murphy 28 B |  |
| Lafayette, Ind. | Hazel M. Schilling 1 M$^c$ | Frank McDill 5 E | John T. Hogan 2 E |  | Harry Laws 1 M |  |
| Lafayette, La. | Edgar G. Mouton 4 |  | Edgar G. Mouton 4 | Edgar G. Mouton 4 | G. A. Martin M | Robert L. Mouton 4 |
| Lagrange, Ga. | Richard Hutchinson 1 M | (Vacant) | J. H. Moss 1 M | G. H. Sargent 1 M | S. C. Rutland 1 C | Viola Burks 1 C |
| La Grange, Ill. | A. D. Bailey 4 E |  | E. B. McKay 2 M |  | Charles F. Scheel 4 E | B. I. Greenlee 8 M |
| Lake Charles, La. | J. H. Funderburg 14 | E. R. Henry 3 | J. H. Funderburg 14 |  | W. P. Bordelon 2 |  |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lakeland, Fla. | | A. C. Walker 11 C | W. F. Reid* A | W. T. McIlwain, Jr. 1 A | J. D. Griffin 1 A | Elberta Marshall* A |
| Lakewood, Ohio | H. A. Rees 3 M | | H. A. Rees 3 M | | W. J. Benner 21 M | A. I. Kauffman |
| Lancaster, Ohio | John W. Barnes E | | Arthur Everitt E | | C. B. Snider B | |
| Lancaster, Pa. | Frederick J. Vaux E | Grover C. Snyder 1 C | A. A. Krimmel, Jr. 1 E | | B. F. Charles 3 B | |
| Lansing, Mich. | R. E. Sanderson 10 M$^{c}$ | (Board of 3) E | Nellie Tallmadge 2 E | John F. Morley 1 C | E. R. Vanderslice 2 B | Fred L. Parshall 2 M |
| La Porte, Ind. | Charles E. Zeisig$^{c}$ | E. Otto Droege E | Carl E. Anderson E | | Jon Kelly 5 M | |
| Laredo, Tex. | A. R. Garcia 15 E | F. A. Lattig 3 E | J. A. Ortig 23 E | A. R. Garcia 15 E | H. M. Austin‡ | |
| La Salle, Ill. | Millera Mason E | Hy. Stuppy E | T. W. Curtin C | | Hubert J. Cline C | Edna Smith C |
| Latrobe, Pa. | V. B. Stader 3‡ | | Henry Swanson 1 C | | W. G. Osborne 20 B | |
| Laurel, Miss. | | Roy J. Sumrall 5 C | McWhorter Beers 2 C | J. M. Williams 2 C | L. B. Beech | |
| Lawrence, Kans. | E. E. Alexander | | F. M. Holliday 1 B | A. E. Woestemeyer 4 B | J. M. Mott 1 M | |
| Lawrence, Mass. | W. A. Griffin 3 E | (Board of 3) C | William A. Kelleher C | Maurice F. McKenna C | David J. Burke‡ | David J. Burke E |
| Lawton, Okla. | | (County) E | R. B. McCoy 8 E | Nettie Pippin 2 E | Fratis L. Duff 2 M | |
| Leavenworth, Kans. | Charles P. Olund* E | | Kate B. Cory 4 B | | A. L. Suwalsky 4 B | |
| Lebanon, Pa. | C. Ray Bell 1 E | R. U. Schock 3 C | Samuel L. Hower 3 E | George H. Biely 1 C | John D. Boger 1 | |
| Leominster, Mass. | Frank A. Shaw 9 M | (Board of 3) M | Charles D. Harnden 9 M | | B. P. Sweeney 6 M | Wm. L. Farrell 9 M |
| Lewiston, Me. | B. C. Tribou 13 M$^{a}$ | (Board of 3) M | Francis V. Crowley 2 M | | R. J. Wiseman, Jr. 8 M | John R. Gilman 2‡ |
| Lewistown, Pa. | | | S. B. Russell 16 C | | H. E. Fetterolf 13 C | |
| Lexington, Ky. | Fred Benckart* A | George R. Curran 3 A | Genevieve Feehan* A | C. W. Fithian 1 A | C. W. Garrison 1 A | |
| Lima, Ohio | Clyde Welty 1 E | | Laurence Long 1 M | A. L. Metheany 1 E | J. B. Poling | J. C. Timberlake |
| Lincoln, Ill. | | | Mary T. Davis 2 E | | Chester Davis 2 M | |
| Lincoln, Nebr. | Theodore H. Berg 22 C$^{a}$ | P. H. Mathews 14 C | L. C. Oberlies 2 E | | M. F. Arnholt 7 C | |
| Lincoln, R. I. | | Arthur Smith 8 E | A. J. Bucklin 3 E | | H. A. Manchester 20 C | M. T. Keane 2 C |
| Lincoln Park, Mich. | J. N. Howard 2 E | William McGathen 10 M | N. C. Ept 9 E | J. M. O'Connor 8 E | Dr. Butterworth 4 M | Mary Blake 1‡ |
| Linden, N. J. | | (Board of 3) C | James J. Smith 2 C | | M. E. Noe 8 B | |
| Little Falls, N. Y. | | (Board of 3) 6 E | Herman J. Misner 2 E | | G. S. Eveleth M | William VanAllen M |
| Little Rock, Ark. | | | G. L. Alexander 2 E | | V. T. Webb 3 M | |
| Lockport, N. Y. | F. D. McLean 5 E | Thomas Feely* M | F. D. McLean 5 E | | George H. Barone 1 B | |
| Lodi, N. J. | M. John Butler 18 E | Mrs. H. McMahon 1 E | M. John Butler 18 E | | John Burke 3 M | James Zito 4 M |
| Logansport, Ind. | | | D. A. Middleton E | | L. P. Deuner 5 M | |
| Long Beach, Calif. | Myrtelle L. Gunsul 15 E$^{a}$ | Burton H. Bridge 11 A | H. C. Morse 13 A | Amy Dutcher* A | S. G. Arnold 2 A | E. M. Edwards* A |
| Long Branch, N. J. | Walton Sherman 3 E | B. D. Woolley 3 B | Walton Sherman 3 E | | J. C. Erickson 3 B | |
| Longview, Wash. | C. C. Tibbetts 3 M | | Faye S. Witt 2 E | | J. S. McCarthy 3 M | |
| Lorain, Ohio | Frank Ayres 3 E$^{a}$ | | P. J. Flaherty 1 E | | Valloyd Adair 22 B | |
| Los Angeles, Calif. | John S. Myers 25 E$^{c}$ | (County) | N. T. Powell 19 M | Alvin J. Holm 2‡ | George Parrish 2 B | Anna B. Smith 14 |
| Louisville, Ky. | John R. Lindsay* M | John Kesselring 1 M | M. P. Corcoran* M | John J. Beirne 1 M | Hugh R. Leavell | K. P. Vinsel 1 M |
| Lowell, Mass. | Daniel E. Martin 11‡$^{a}$ | (Board of 3) M | Charles R. Flood 1 M | John E. O'Brien 1 M | J. M. McNanamara 6 B | (Board of 5) |
| Lubbock, Tex. | D. D. Martin 6 M | Ed. Young 1 M | W. O. Stevens 1 M | W. H. Rodgers 4 M | J. W. Rolla 8 M | |
| Lynbrook, N. Y. | Sidney Alexander 2 C | Ralph B. Thompson 7 C | Sidney Alexander 2 C | | F. M. Galloway 7 B | Mary Dickson 4 B |
| Lynchburg, Va. | John M. Otey 30 C$^{a}$ | Charles C. MacLeod 1 E | George M. Bell 20 E | Karl V. Ogden 12 A | Mosby G. Perrow | M. G. Perrow 20 A |
| Lynn, Mass. | Charles H. Tucker 27 C$^{a}$ | (Board of 3) C | Joseph Cole* C | J. Fred Manning 5 E | James Dumas 1 M | William Simonds B |
| McAlester, Okla. | V. G. Thompson 3 C | (County) | A. M. Dunham 8 A | V. G. Thompson 3 C | Charles M. Pearce 6 A | |
| McComb, Miss. | Xavier A. Kramer 6 E | T. M. Stewart 17 C | | | W. R. Watkins 4 E | |
| McKeesport, Pa. | J. D. Evans 6 E | Robert E. Taylor* C | George W. Gray 15 E | | Daniel F. Marsh 12‡ | |
| McKees Rocks, Pa. | D. J. Buckley | Edward Kennedy | H. B. Supinger | | William Westwood | |

TABLE VIII-B.—DIRECTORY OF CITY OFFICIALS IN ALL CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued

| City | Chief Finance Officer | City Assessor | City Treasurer | Purchasing Agent | Health Officer | Director of Public Welfare |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Macon, Ga. | Rufus W. Evans 7 C | I. L. Dunwody 7 C | Rufus W. Evans 7 C | David S. Jones 7 C | W. K. Stewart* B | |
| Madison, Wis. | George Nelson 8 C[a] | John Stock 12 C | Frank A. Maxwell 3 E | Bernard L. Gill 4 C | F. F. Bowman 7 B | (Board) |
| Mahanoy City, Pa. | | | Joe. Anserange | | Harry Martin 6 C | |
| Malden, Mass. | Wm. F. Galvin, Jr. 5 C | Clarence E. Carney 12 C | W. E. Milliken 14 C | | Edward J. Convrey 11 B | Joseph W. Proctor 25 C |
| Mamaroneck, N. Y. | | A. V. Hains 2 A | F. H. Bull, Jr. 4 C | | E. M. Clark 31 A | |
| Manchester, N. H. | Felix A. Lepage 3 M[a] | (Board of 3) 6 C | F. D. McLaughlin 3 C | | H. A. Streeter 11 B | Francis X. Carroll 3 E |
| Manhattan, Kans. | Sam C. Charlson 2 E | | Emil Thoes 7 B | A. L. Hjort 1 B | D. L. Evans 1‡ | |
| Manitowoc, Wis. | | R. Herrman 3 C | W. C. Herrmann 15 E | A. H. Zander 16 C | George Hoffman 4 M | |
| Mankato, Minn. | George G. Krost 2 E | F. J. Sperry 2 C | C. K. Kennedy 2 C | | W. A. Beach 2 C | |
| Mansfield, Ohio | Paul L. Kelley 11 E | | Glenn Davidson 1 E | | James Cuneman 10 B | |
| Maplewood, Mo. | Joe Carr 2 E | Dan Sheerin 2‡ | Udell Thomson 2 C | | P. M. Brossard 2 C | A. S. Fuller E |
| Marietta, Ohio | Harold D. Brooker 3 E[a] | | Mrs. H. R. Buchanan 1 E | | F. S. McGee 1 B | |
| Marinette, Wis. | John Moore 21 M | Chas. H. Anderson 8 E | John Doran‡ | R. P. Murray 8 E | J. W. Boren 6 M | |
| Marion, Ind. | Ray E. Norman | | Earl R. Love 2 | | G. R. Daniels 4 M | |
| Marion, Ohio | F. J. Weber 1 E[a] | | Kenneth Tobin 1 E | | Kenneth Smith 2 B | Jesse A. Warrick 1 |
| Marlborough, Mass. | Earnest L. Faunce 10 M | (Board of 3) | Wm. H. Osgood 33 M | | John J. Cassidy | Clarence E. Sanford 3 B |
| Marquette, Mich. | Joseph Cone 1 C | F. J. Schultheis 8 C | John C. Wilson 5 C | Joseph Cone 1 C | F. M. Harkin 1 C | |
| Marshall, Tex. | | J. J. Jones 14 A | Newman Wells 2 C | H. J. Graeser 8 C | W. H. Bennett 2 A | W. H. Bennett 2 A |
| Marshalltown, Iowa | E. B. Clinton 2 M | H. F. Clemens 13 E | E. J. Paul 4 E | | R. S. Grossman 2 M | |
| Martinsburg, W. Va. | | (County) | E. W. Kline 6 | C. H. Dailey | Edwin Cameron | |
| Martins Ferry, Ohio | E. H. Shrodes 2 E | | E. T. Crump 4 E | | John Donovan 4 B | |
| Mason City, Iowa | Rena Mack 13[a] | W. H. Gleason 2 C | R. E. Wiley 8 C | L. Rice 2 | C. M. Franchere 2 A | Mabel M. Blaise 5‡ |
| Massena, N. Y. | | C. J. Ward 2 C | C. J. Kellenberg 1 C | O. T. McGuiggan 6 C | O. T. McGuiggan 6 C | O. T. McGuiggan 6 C |
| Massillon, Ohio | Joseph Frohman 2 E[a] | | Joseph A. Putman 6 E | | D. L. Fisher 2 B | |
| Mattoon, Ill. | | | Clyde Isham 2 E | | L. A. Neal 2 M | |
| Maywood, Ill. | Earle Whitcombe 4 C[c] | E. B. Hoffman 7 | G. E. Schroeder 17 C | Earle Whitcombe 4 C | John Peters 5 C | |
| Meadville, Pa. | C. C. Cunningham 3 E | Jas. S. Charlton 3 C | Don C. DeLancey 7 E | | John Laley 15 B | |
| Medford, Mass. | A. A. Lucey 12 M[a] | Wm. F. Grady 6 M | John J. Ward 6 M | Louis J. Dodsworth 3 M | Walter T. Burke 12 M | Teresa St. Denis 8 M |
| Medford, Ore. | | | Gus H. Samuels 12 E | F. W. Scheffel M | L. D. Inskeep 6 M | |
| Melrose, Mass. | Gardner B. Wardwell 2[a] | (Board of 3) M | S. H. Buttrick 8 C | | Clarence P. Holden 34 M | Laura G. Talbot 2 C |
| Melrose Park, Ill. | | | F. K. Strzynecki 6 M | M. J. Provenzano 6 M | E. G. Brust 2 M | |
| Memphis, Tenn. | C. A. Gates 2 E | Guy E. Joyner 7 E | K. L. Nazor 3 C | G. Hollingsworth 4 C | L. M. Graves 7 C | Clifford Davis 7 E |
| Menominee, Mich. | | Edward Nowack 4 E | Rudolph Cernoch 9 E | A. B. Siegel 10 C | J. T. Kaye 4 C | |
| Meriden, Conn. | Edward A. Birdsey 3 E[c] | Walter Savage | Edward J. Pickett 3 E | | Joseph A. Cooke 3 | Frank W. Kraemer 3 |
| Meridian, Miss. | | W. W. George 2 C | M. L. Rush 2 C | | C. T. Burt 2 C | |
| Methuen, Mass. | William H. Ruediger[a] | (Board of 3) E | Tom Longworth 1 E | | Albert Slack 15 C | Albert Slack 15 C |
| Miami, Fla. | William Tracy 7‡[a] | G. R. Green 8 A | A. E. Fuller 4 A | R. B. Grant 2 A | G. N. MacDonell 2 A | |
| Michigan City, Ind. | George Gruse* M | | William H. Fink 25 E | | Dr. Robrock 3 B | |
| Middlesborough, Ky. | H. B. Stallard 1 E | B. N. Parsons 1 C | R. K. Judy 1 C | H. B. Stallard 1 E | Ike Ginsburg 1 E | Ike Ginsburg 1 E |
| Middletown, Conn. | R. J. Wamester 2 M[c] | John J. Tynan 6 M | Oscar B. Welker* E | | John H. Mountain 8 M | Raymond H. Wilcox 6 M |
| Middletown, N. Y. | | L. S. Conkling 5 M | Percy E. Benedict 2 M | | H. J. Shelley 11 B | Allie K. Dayton 17 M |
| Middletown, Ohio | C. H. Campbell 10‡ | | Hilda E. Ross 1‡ | Hiram Fullen 1‡ | G. D. Lummis 45‡ | Hiram Fullen 1‡ |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Milford, Mass. | Michael J. Hannigan 5 C | (Board of 3) E | B. J. Clancy 11 E | | James F. McDonough | (Board of 3) E |
| Millville, N. J. | W. J. Simmerman 14 E | John W. Matthews 2 C | George B. Worstall 22 C | | Richard H. Knowles 6 C | |
| Milton, Mass. | Mary A. Berni 7 C | Wm. W. Churchill 32 E | Clyde L. Whittier 3 E | | P. W. Kimball 10 B | F. F. Green 3 B |
| Milwaukee, Wis. | William H. Wendt 2‡$^{c}$ | Louis A. Arnold 13 M | J. W. Mudroch 3 E | J. W. Nicholson 8‡ | J. P. Koehler 10 M | |
| Minneapolis, Minn. | O. J. Turner 1 E$^{c}$ | Edward S. Gould 2 C | C. A. Bloomquist 26 E | Fred S. Gram 20‡ | F. Harrington 15 B | M. U. S. Kjorlaug 4 B |
| Minot, N. D. | J. B. Schmidt 1 A$^{a}$ | M. J. Engeseth 2 A | Keith Thompson 2 A | J. W. Bliss 2 C | J. L. Devine 2 A | J. L. Devine 2 A |
| Mishawaka, Ind. | Ralph W. Gaylor* M$^{c}$ | | Earl F. Aldrich* E | | H. J. Magrane 10 M | |
| Missoula, Mont. | R. L. Arnold 1 C | | George K. Dick 5 C | | F. D. Pease 15‡ | |
| Mitchell, S. D. | Thomas Eastcott 15 M$^{a}$ | L. F. Geiger 2 M | A. M. Shaw 1 M | Thomas Eastcott C | E. M. Young 10 M | |
| Moberly, Mo. | T. R. Bell 4 M | J. W. Thackston 12 E | Ambrose Rucker 2 E | Roy O. Fray 4 M | C. C. Smith 2 M | T. B. Allen 3 M |
| Mobile, Ala. | H. G. Zeigler$^{c}$ | Martin Horst | Martin Horst | R. V. Taylor | O. L. Chason | Bessie Rencher |
| Modesto, Calif. | H. E. Gragg 12 C$^{a}$ | H. E. Gragg 12 C | H. E. Gragg 12 C | | E. F. Reamer 5 C | A. N. Brown 4 E |
| Moline, Ill. | Mrs. A. N. Brissman 6 E | A. J. Kucheman E | C. J. Klingebiel 2 E | J. Milton Peterson* M | A. C. Stouffer 11 M | |
| Monessen, Pa. | Daniel Reamer 1 E | Albert Marchione 5 C | Lorrin Culler 13 E | Daniel Reamer 1 E | F. C. Duvall 1 C | |
| Monroe, La. | | | P. A. Poag 20‡ | | Henry Haas 5‡ | |
| Monroe, Mich. | | J. Emmett Kirby 9 C | Anton W. Munch 12 E | Stuart M. Weaver* C | James H. Humphrey 1 C | Albert Hale 3 E |
| Monrovia, Calif. | | | A. K. Petrie 3 E | C. L. Daniels 12 C | J. M. Furstman 11‡ | J. M. Hume 2 C |
| Montclair, N. J. | W. I. L. Adams 3‡ | David H. Mabey 4‡ | George S. Courter 6‡ | Stanley R. Humbert 6‡ | Carl G. Pomeroy 11‡ | Oscar L. Carlson 3 E |
| Montgomery, Ala. | W. A. Gunter 16 E | | J. L. Cobbs 16 C | A. M. Anderson 16 C | J. L. Bowman 10 B | |
| Morgantown, W. Va. | | | Russel K. Bolton 1 C | Elmer W. Prince 1 C | R. C. Farrier | |
| Morristown, N. J. | Thomas H. Wiss 14 C | (Board of 3) 11 C | Thomas H. Wiss 14 C | Nelson S. Butera 4 C | John F. Kilkenny 21‡ | |
| Moundsville, W. Va. | John F. Hopkins 2 E | | (Bank) | | W. G. C. Hill | |
| Mount Carmel, Pa. | Herman Ludes 1 C | | F. J. G. Smith 1 C | Reynold Vitacco* C | Charles Cahoon 1 B | |
| Mount Clemens, Mich. | A. J. Warren 2 E | Harold Lindsey 1 C | George A. Dankers 1 C | | W. J. Kane 2‡ | |
| Mount Vernon, Ill. | | | Robt. C. Crosnoe* M | | W. G. Parker 2 M | |
| Mount Vernon, **N. Y.** | John Lynn 1 E$^{c}$ | Edwin W. Pattison 11 M | | John Lynn 1 E | Frank Shipman 11 M | James D. Connor 3 M |
| Muncie, Ind. | H. L. Parkinson 1 M$^{c}$ | | Ray W. Pittenger 3 E | | J. F. LaDuron 1 M | (Board) |
| Munhall, Pa. | | (County) | W. C. McClure 1 C | L. Y. Woodward 7 C | W. J. Caddy 1 C | |
| Muscatine, Iowa | | R. P. Jacobs 1 E | Ray Reesink 2 E | | R. M. Arey 6 B | |
| Muskegon, Mich. | F. F. Bowles 8 C$^{a}$ | Burt Hatch 11 C | Anna Voss 18 C | C. H. Peterson 1 C | M. E. Stone A | Benjamin Pekelder 20 A |
| Muskegon Hgts., Mich. | M. Kroeze 10$^{a}$ | Henry Seng 6 E | Frank Wood 2 E | George F. Liddle 2 M | O. M. Lacore 6 M | Paul C. Marquand 4 M |
| Muskogee, Okla. | R. L. Davis 6 A$^{a}$ | | L. W. McLean 8 C | Jess Robinson 3 A | J. T. Woodburn 2 A | |
| **N**anticoke, Pa. | Stanley Drapiewski 8 E | John G. Williams 2 | Adam Olzewski 6 E | | Judd Abbot 7‡ | |
| Nashua, N. H. | Arthur L. Cyr 27$^{a}$ | M. D. Cobleigh | Samuel Dearborn 21 | | Frank E. Cullen | Arthur L. Cyr 27 |
| Nashville, Tenn. | W. B. Cook 12 M$^{c}$ | Vernon H. Sharp 20 M | Allen B. Cummings 12 M | Verner Tolmie 12 M | John Overton 8 M | |
| Natchez, Miss. | | | | | Loren Wallin | |
| Natick, Mass. | | (Board of 3)‡ | Walter D. Leavitt 1 E | | James Vance‡ | Howard Leavitt E |
| Naugatuck, Conn. | | | Anthony Mariano 1 E | | Walter Baker 19 | N. Hadley Cox 2 B |
| Needham, Mass. | Clarence E. Foss$^{a}$ | Arthur H. Godfrey 3 | C. E. Stanwood 28 E | | G. Donald Buckner 5 B | Evan C. Thorpe 2 E |
| New Albany, Ind. | Joel M. Ford 1 E$^{c}$ | (Township) | (County) | | W. L. Starr 1 M | (Board) |
| Newark, N. J. | Reginald Parnell 1 E | Reginald Parnell 1 E | Reginald Parnell 1 E | William A. Adams 1‡ | Charles V. Craster 18‡ | Pearce R. Franklin 1 E |
| Newark, Ohio | S. O. Coyle 1 E$^{a}$ | | H. L. Cromer 3 E | Guy W. Lawyer 3 M | W. H. Knauss 25 B | |
| New Bedford, **Mass.** | Charles J. McGurk 33$^{a}$ | (Board of 3) | | | Wm. G. Kirschbaum 36 | Miner W. Wilcox 2 |
| New Bern, N. C. | D. M. Roberts C | J. A. Patterson C | D. M. Roberts C | L. C. Scott C | N. M. Gibbs B | |
| New Britain, Conn. | William H. Day 5 E$^{c}$ | Thomas Linder B | Curtiss L. Sheldon E | | Louis Dumont B | John J. Doyle B |
| New Brunswick, N. J. | J. H. Whitfield 16 M$^{c}$ | Edward Banker 16 C | William G. Howell 16 C | | Irving Cronk 12 C | George F. Baier 1 C |

## Table VIII-B.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Chief Finance Officer | City Assessor | City Treasurer | Purchasing Agent | Health Officer | Director of Public Welfare |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Newburgh, N. Y. | A. B. Slaughter 1 A$^c$ | Stewart Galloway A | | Joseph A. Fogarty 1 C | Thomas J. Burke 21 C | John L. Sloan |
| Newburyport, Mass. | William Balch 28 M | John Shea 9 M | Chas. E. Houghton 15 M | | Wilbur N. O'Brien 5 B | F. W. Kneeland 2 M |
| New Castle, Ind. | | | John Rutlidge 1 E | | Dean L. Ross 9 M | |
| New Castle, Pa. | A. A. Hoyland 3 E | | L. W. McClung 3 E | J. D. Alexander 1 E | W. L. Steen 16 C | D. O. Davies E |
| New Haven, Conn. | G. H. Brethauer 2 E$^c$ | Ralph L. Bishop 3 M | Walter P. Johnson 2 E | | S. J. Goldberg 1 B | Hugh J. Gartland 3 M |
| New Kensington, Pa. | W. K. Henley 1 E | W. C. Walley C | J. M. Stewart 1 E | | John Evans 1 C | |
| New London, Conn. | Carey Congdon 13 A | J. H. Manwaring 5 A | H. G. Huntley 13 A | Thomas Fitch 4 A | Benj. N. Pennell 14 A | William A. Holt 11 C |
| New Orleans, La. | W. T. Ryan$^a$ | (Board of 7) E | William S. Daly 5‡ | W. J. Legier 5‡ | W. H. Robin 5 B | Mary Raymond M |
| New Philadelphia, Ohio | R. L. Swinderman 3 E$^a$ | | L. B. Stonebrook 1 E | | J. Blickensderfer 12‡ | |
| Newport, Ky. | R. J. Rohde 3 A | Walter McKeown 1 A | R. J. Rohde 3 A | K. C. Rainey 1 A | John Todd 6 A | |
| Newport, R. I. | | John B. Sullivan 8 C | Benj. F. Downing 6 C | | Edward V. Murphy 9 B | (Board of 3) C |
| Newport News, Va. | L. J. Kopke 14 C$^a$ | R. L. Cosby 18 E | W. E. Jones 1 E | A. M. Hamilton 12 C | G. Colbert Tyler 5 A | J. C. Biggins 10 C |
| New Rochelle, N. Y. | Walter J. Brennan 3 A | Paul Bankson 1‡ | J. P. Nestler 9‡ | George I. Roberts 3 A | Bertrand F. Drake 3‡ | Frank Koch 1 A |
| Newton, Iowa | | C. E. Kendall 2 E | M. G. Addicks 6 E | | M. R. Hammer 2 M | |
| Newton, Kans. | Adella Martin 27 A | (County) | Elizabeth Ingold 17 A | Knowland L. Brode 4 C | M. C. Martin | Knowland L. Brode 4 C |
| Newton, Mass. | Daniel A. White$^c$ | John W. Murphy 17 M | Francis Newhall 30 C | | Francis G. Curtis 45 M | Miss F.S.Fitzgerald 10 M |
| New York, N. Y. | Frank Taylor* E$^c$ | (Board) 1 M | A. A. Berle 1 M | Russell Forbes 1 M | John L. Rice 1 M | Wm. Hodson 1 M |
| Niagara Falls, N. Y. | Frank L. Monin 1 C$^c$ | John Palumbo 1 C | Daniel P. King 3 A | Edward T. Arnold 3 A | E. E. Gillick 11 A | Dolly A. Flay 1 A |
| Niles, Mich. | C. G. Wasson 3 E | | Ilah Warren 2 E | | L. M. Rutz 1 M | |
| Niles, Ohio | Homer Thomas 25 E | | J. H. Rosensteel 16 E | | W. A. Werner 20 B | |
| Norfolk, Nebr. | Charles Everling | (County) | Bertha Cooper 12 E | | V. L. Simon 2 M | |
| Norfolk, Va. | Preston A. Breeden 1 C$^a$ | A. P. Pannill 17 E | B. G. Tungstall 25 E | I. R. Vanderberry 8 A | J. C. Sleet 2‡ | H. G. Parker 4 A |
| Norristown, Pa. | Frank A. Logan 4 C | (Board of 12) | Frank A. Logan 4 C | F. Lester Smith 8 C | R. Ronald Dettre 5 C | |
| North Adams, Mass. | D. J. Hawthorne 1 E$^a$ | (Board of 3) E | J. O'Halloran 8 M | | Douglas W. Hyde | J. B. Ruane 2 M |
| Northampton, Mass. | Horace C. LaFleur 12 E$^a$ | F. M. Starkweather 33 E | Albina L. Richard 11 E | | George R. Turner 29 B | Wm. E. Shannon 34 B |
| N. Attleborough, Mass. | Allan Gordon 6‡ | Wm. C. Middleton 15 E | M. I. Furbish 11 E | | H. Irving Bixby 3 E | Frederick W. Sears 3 E |
| North Braddock, Pa. | Percy C. Bridges 4 C | | Percy C. Bridges 4 C | | Michael Pastor 1 B | |
| N. Little Rock, Ark. | Hennegin Croft & Co.‡$^a$ | | Percy Machin 6 E | U. E. Moore 4 E | Dr. Summers 8 M | John Pruniski 6 M |
| North Platte, Nebr. | George E. Prosser | | L. E. Mehlman 12 E | | Joel Anderson* M | |
| North Providence, R. I. | | (Board of 3) C | William L. Clark 2 E | | Mario Palmieri C | Richard MacDonald C |
| N. Tonawanda, N. Y. | | Glen Treichler 17 C | E. S. Hering 1 E | J. M. Zimmerman 1 M | H. C. Lapp 11 M | L. F. Eggert 1 M |
| Norwalk, Conn. | Stephen Dokus 3 M$^c$ | Chas. T. McGovern 1 M | Daniel J. Farrell 1 E | | Robert E. Perdue 7 M | William F. Taylor 6 M |
| Norwich, Conn. | | | Charles S. Avery | | Harrison Gray | |
| Norwood, Mass. | William H. Connor 3 E | P. J. Lydon 13 C | Edmund F. Sullivan 4 E | W. C. Kendrick 1 C | John A. Shannon | (Board of 3) 3 C |
| Norwood, Ohio | Harry Filder 14 B | | Edward H. Nieporte 1 E | Edgar H. Kelley 1 M | Leon Campbell 1 B | |
| Nutley, N. J. | Raleigh S. Rife 3 E | Henry Conover 3 C | Frank E. Drake 6 C | Simon Blum 12‡ | E. H. Sullivan 15 C | Fred H. Young 3‡ |
| Oakland, Calif. | Harry G. Williams 16 E$^a$ | Harry G. Williams 16 E | R. O. Waring 1 A | Harry Hintze 1 A | N. N. Ashley 1 A | |
| Oak Park, Ill. | T. R. Leth 4 M$^c$ | H. E. Hopkins 2 E | Henry W. Austin 10 E | D. C. Meyers 12 M | F. S. Needham 17 M | A. W. Wyman 2 E |
| Ogden, Utah | Anna May Collins 1 E | | Murray W. Whitney 1 M | Clifford Halliday 1 M | W. J. Wilson 1 M | Harmon W. Peery 1 E |
| Ogdensburg, N. Y. | | James Willard 5 M | Merritt M. Morse 8‡ | | Frederick E. Clark 2 M | Charles S. Hubbard 4 M |
| Oil City, Pa. | E. R. Gnade 2 E | B. N. Sutley 4 C | C. G. Whitehill 3 E | E. R. Gnade 2 E | W. J. Lewis 20 C | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | J. W. Ammerman 20 A | S. G. Brink 8 | Walter H. Miles 16 A | |
| Okmulgee, Okla. | H. DeVinna 1 E | | M. F. Moroney 3 E | | Raymond DeVoy 3 M | |
| Old Forge, Pa. | | | | | George Allen | |
| Olean, N. Y. | Frank C. Kamler 1 Ma | E. G. McGranaghan 5 M | E. M. Weis 3 M | | J. P. Garen 3 M | A. M. Gibbs 2 M |
| Olympia, Wash. | David Gammell* E | | O. U. Tatro*‡ | Edward C. Dohm* C | W. L. Bridgford 6 M | |
| Olyphant, Pa. | | | | | Ignatious Zewan | |
| Omaha, Nebr. | Charles E. Stenicka 12 Cc | | Otto J. Bauman 9 E | Frank S. Welty 3 C | Floyd Kinyoun 3 C | C. Ray McKay 3 C |
| Oneida, N. Y. | Robert H. DeWitt 8 Mc | Fred Greer 3 E | Charles W. Smith 1 E | Joseph Maher 1 | E. L. Finley 1 B | George Pardee* M |
| Oneonta, N. Y. | | | C. H. Bowdish 22 E | | G. W. Augustin 20 M | B. H. Chesbro 3 M |
| Ontario, Calif. | | | Lulu F. Lyle 3 E | Austin Burt 7 C | C. L. Emmons 20 C | |
| Orange, N. J. | Ovid C. Bianchi 1 C | John Keaster 20 C | John C. Crowe 1‡ | | Harry B. Harris* M | |
| Orlando, Fla. | W. C. Lanier 3 Cc | O. L. Sutliff 1 C | | J. G. Manuel 3 C | Claude Anderson 1 C | |
| Oshkosh, Wis. | Rud. Kriz 2 Ec | John Hackbarth M | Harvey A. Golow 2 E | | J. J Kronzer 2 M | |
| Oskaloosa, Iowa | | Harry Glenn 1 E | W. E. McCurdy 2 E | | O. J. Dubois 2 C | |
| Ossining, N. Y. | Howard Dunscomb 4 M | | Ralph Roberts 7 E | Lewis H. Acker 8 C | R. R. Bloom 9 C | |
| Oswego, N. Y. | | George V. Joy 8 M | Frank D. Dowdle 1 M | | James E. Mansfield 3 B | Edw. J. McKinley 5 B |
| Ottawa, Ill. | J. G. Schumacher 12 E | | Joseph Brundage 4 C | | E. P. Hatheway 8 C | |
| Ottumwa, Iowa | H. W. King 6 Ma | S. K. Alderdice 15 C | C. Fred Sonntag 2 C | | A. G. Erskine 10 C | |
| Owensboro, Ky. | J. D. Russell | Jim Mobberly 6 C | 1st Owensboro Bank C | | Dr. Seigler 2 C | Mrs. G. Weill 10 |
| Owosso, Mich. | G. A. VanEpps 6 C | M. F. Growe 15 C | Wayne J. Taylor 5 C | | W. E. Ward 15 C | |
| Paducah, Ky. | Bess B. Washam 1 A | J. West Troutman 19 A | Bess B. Washam 1 A | L. V. Bean 1 C | R. W. Robertson 1 A | Katherine Croach 4 B |
| Painesville, Ohio | W. L. Clipp 9 Ca | | J. H. Fitzgerald 1 C | | Clara Wilder 11 B | |
| Palestine, Tex. | | J. W. McAllister 1‡ | J. E. Angly | | J. M. Colley‡ | |
| Palo Alto, Calif. | F. V. Pering 11 Ca | E. L. Beach 10 C | W. C. Cobb 4 C | J. B. Buchanan 10 B | Louis Olsen 18 B | |
| Pampa, Tex. | | W. M. Craven 1 A | | C. L. Stine 3 C | T. J. Worrell 5 A | Mrs. W. H. Davis 4 B |
| Paris, Tex. | | | Ed. H. McCuistion C | J. Morgan Crook 9 | J. A. Stephens M | |
| Parkersburg, W. Va. | C. Gail Hitt 7 E | | C. Gail Hitt 7 E | | F. R. Knight 15 M | |
| Park Ridge, Ill. | Harry Jacoby 4 E | Robert McGregor 2 E | Leonard H. Johnson 2 E | | M. W. Caveney 3 M | |
| Parma, Ohio | Samuel S. Nowlin 2 Ea | | Josephine Baker 2 E | | Robert Lockhart | |
| Parsons, Kans. | E. R. Gould 4 E | | Frank A. Pfeiffer 9 C | | M. C. Ruble 4 M | Alfred Coad 4 E |
| Pasadena, Calif. | Miner B. Phillipps 4 Ac | S. F. Cheshire 19 A | B. H. Rhodes 12 A | Muriel Hobday 8 A | Wilton L. Halverson* A | C. J. Wilcoxson 3 A |
| Passaic, N. J. | Henry C. Whitehead 4 E | Edw. J. Levendusky 12‡ | William F. Laporte 3‡ | G. P. Heinzmann 12‡ | John N. Ryan 16‡ | Harry E. Ketcham 1 E |
| Paterson, N. J. | A. J. Farrell 7‡ | (Board of 5) | John A. Egan 7 M | (Board of Finance) | F. P. Lee 11 M | James O'Gorman 2‡ |
| Pawtucket, R. I. | Thomas P. McCoy 2 Ca | James J. Garvey 1 C | Vincent J. McAloon 2 C | Grover C. Haberlin 2 B | A. L. Vandale 2 C. | R. E. Kelley 2 C |
| Peabody, Mass. | John A. Lynch 6 M | (Board of 3) M | Patrick M. Cahill 4 M | | Percy Murray 18 M | J. J. Ray 18 M |
| Peekskill, N. Y. | Albert E. Cruger 30 E | William J. Donovan 1 C | | | J. Douglas Barry 2 C | |
| Pekin, Ill. | George Behrens 10 M | George Behrens 10 M | George Behrens 10 M | | N. A. Wright 4 M | |
| Pensacola, Fla. | George J. Roark 3 C | L. W. Wells 3 A | J. E. Frenkel 3 A | George J. Roark 3 C | W. A. McPhaul 3‡ | George J. Roark 3 C |
| Peoria, Ill. | F. G. Bruninga 2 Mc | D. J. Goggin 4 E | H. S. Weston 2 E | J. F. McKiernan 2 M | E. A. Garrett 2 M | |
| Perth Amboy, N. J. | E. J. Dalton 12‡ | (Board of 3)‡ | J. E. Hornsby 12‡ | | C. S. Thompson‡ | R. E. Seaman E |
| Peru, Ind. | | | Harry E. Worl 4 E | | F. M. Lynn 4 M | |
| Petersburg, Va. | Wm. F. Spotswood 12 Ca | Hugh R. Smith E | I. Val Parham 4 E | I. C. Chandler 5 A | Mason Romaine 4 A | H. A. Yancey 3 C |
| Phenix City, Ala. | | G. B. Pittman* E | Joseph S. Bird* E | Joseph S. Bird* E | J. L. Shadrach* E | |
| Philadelphia, Pa. | S. Davis Wilson 1 Ec | (Board of 3) | Will B. Hadley 1 E | Joseph Hagerdorn 3 M | J. Norman Henry 3 M | Clinton R. Woodruff 3 M |
| Phillipsburg, N. J. | Geo. L. Hartman 5 E | M. B. Bercaw 5 C | J. L. Lomerson 40 C | | W. Danna Purcell 3 C | Shipman Purcell 1‡ |
| Phoenix, Ariz. | John A. Durden Ca | L. S. Henderson A | O. H. Loch C | R. A. Woodson A | B. M. Berger A | |

TABLE VIII-B.—DIRECTORY OF CITY OFFICIALS IN ALL CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued

| City | Chief Finance Officer | City Assessor | City Treasurer | Purchasing Agent | Health Officer | Director of Public Welfare |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Phoenixville, Pa. | Norman G. Young 5 C | (Board of 6) E | John T. Bush 6‡ | Norman G. Young 5 C | Russel Deery 5 B | |
| Pine Bluff, Ark. | Charles A. Gordon E | | G. C. Roberts E | | W. H. Bruce‡ | |
| Piqua, Ohio | W. J. Baldwin 5 A | | Mary Sawyer 5 A | W. J. Baldwin 5 A | L. G. Whitney 6 A | L. G. Whitney 6 A |
| Pittsburg, Kans. | W. L. Baldwin 20 C$^{a}$ | | Eddie Weeks 2 C | | C. M. Montee 2 C | |
| Pittsburgh, Pa. | James P. Kerr 5 E$^{c}$ | Percy C. Williams 1 M | James P. Kirk 1 M | John J. Murray 1 M | Ray P. Moyer 1 M | Southard Hay 1 M |
| Pittsfield, Mass. | Fred H. Chant 1 M$^{a}$ | (Board of 3) M | H. Edward Hayn 1 M | | Willys N. Monroe 11 M | Chas. H. Hoedecker 1 M |
| Pittston, Pa. | Thos. J. Gallagher 11 E | John J. Murray 5 C | M. P. Ruane 11 E | | M. McHale 11 C | |
| Plainfield, N. J. | R. R. Deardorff 9 M | (Board of 4) 4 M | Arthur E. Crone 12 E | R. R. Deardorff 9 M | Andrew J. Krog 3 B | E. Yannotta 3 M |
| Plattsburg, N. Y. | Susan E. Arthur 5 M | (Board of 3) M | Susan E. Arthur 5 M | Leander A. Bouyea 3 E | Leo F. Schiff 11 B | Verian D. Otis 3 M |
| Pleasantville, N. J. | | | | | Robert M. Grier | |
| Plymouth, Mass. | Elmer R. Harlow$^{a}$ | | | | | |
| Plymouth, Pa. | John J. Roberts 5 E$^{c}$ | (County) | Stephen Yeosock 1 C | George Trebilcox 5 C | John Harrison C | |
| Pocatello, Idaho | J. Ward Green | (County) | J. Ward Green 2 M | J. G. Burton 2 M | W. W. Brothers 4 M | W. L. Raymond 8 M |
| Pomona, Calif. | H. A. Leigh | | E. Elizabeth Dillin 2 E | C. C. Williams* C | M. U. Stoneman 4‡ | |
| Ponca City, Okla. | G. F. Smith 2 E | | Jay G. Paris 2 C | | A. S. Nuckols 4 C | |
| Pontiac, Mich. | E. H. Tinsman 3 C | W. R. Ransom 1 C | George Johnston 25 A | W. P. Edmonson 2 C | H. M. Heitsch 2 A | |
| Port Angeles, Wash. | S. J. Lutz 1 E | | Madge H. Nailor 15‡ | | Will H. Taylor 3 M | |
| Port Arthur, Tex. | Robert L. Cooper 3 C | E. B. McSwain 8 A | E. B. McSwain 8 A | J. Campbell 1 A | F. J. Beyt 3 A | F. J. Beyt 3 A |
| Port Chester, N. Y. | Chas. O. Frederick 3 C | William D. Hill 3 C | Charles O. Frederick 3 C | Charles O. Frederick 3 C | William Sheehan 15 C | James Miner 2 B |
| Port Huron, Mich. | Thomas H. Molloy 10 E | M. N. Petit 18 C | Earl Madill 12 C | Emma C. Fitzpatrick 13C | A. L. Callory C | L. R. Glassford |
| Port Jervis, N. Y. | | | Paul A. Symonds 7 E | | G. Otto Pobe 16 C | |
| Portland, Me. | A. Edwin Smith 11 C$^{a}$ | | John R. Gilmartin 17 C | Wm. O. Thompson 10 A | Thomas Tetreau 18 A | Percy R. Horton 25 A |
| Portland, Ore. | R. E. Riley 4 E | | William Adams 24 C | L. A. Baumhover 3 C | J. G. Abele 11 C | |
| Portsmouth, N. H. | Robert M. Bruce 12 C$^{a}$ | (Board of 3) E | Charles R. Kimball 4 C | | Lawrence R. Hazzard 4 C | Elizabeth C. Mooney 1 C |
| Portsmouth, Ohio | Wm. N. Gableman 5 C | | Wm. N. Gableman 5 C | Adolph Graf 5 A | O. D. Tatje B | |
| Portsmouth, Va. | L. C. Brinson 20 C$^{a}$ | | Mary M. Hudgins 8 E | L. C. Brinson 19 | Lonsdale J. Roper | L. J. Roper 18 A |
| Pottstown, Pa. | John F. Stamm$^{a}$ | (Board of 10) | Wilmer N. Keck 3 C | | A. J. Andre 6 C | |
| Pottsville, Pa. | J. B. Bowman* | Frank W. Leib 11‡ | F. P. Mortimer*‡ | | Alex C. Huntzinger | |
| Poughkeepsie, N. Y. | Carl Silber 2 C | Edgar B. Baker 2 M | LeGrande Crippen 2 M | | William H. Conger 13 B | William L. Burnett 2 B |
| Providence, R. I. | William F. Brown 4 C$^{a}$ | Joseph H. Kiernan 4 C | W. F. Fitzpatrick 6 C | | D. L. Richardson 3 C | Edward P. Reidy 5 C |
| Provo, Utah | Mary F. Smith 10 E$^{a}$ | L. T. Atwood 2 E | T. J. Oldroyd 3 M | | C. M. Smith 4 M | |
| Pueblo, Colo. | J. W. Carpenter 9 E | | J. W. Carpenter 9 E | J. W. Carpenter 9 E | W. E. Buck‡ | |
| Quincy, Ill. | Leo F. Amen 2 M$^{c}$ | Charles Zang 8 M | H. J. J. Broemmel 2 M | | H. O. Collins 3‡ | |
| Quincy, Mass. | George H. Bonsall 2 C | (Board of 3) M | K. D. McLennan 2 M | | E. B. Fitzgerald 6 M | Roland Broberg 2 M |
| Racine, Wis. | James C. Peterson 4 E$^{c}$ | Walter Hood 14 E | A. J. Eisenhut 25 E | C. Irving Hanson* M | I. F. Thompson 3 M | |
| Rahway, N. J. | J. J. Hoffman 4 C | George Gage 5 C | J. J. Hoffman 4 C | | Fred Williams 10 B | |
| Raleigh, N. C. | W. R. Price 13‡ | S. F. Taylor 4‡ | J. H. Brown 2 E | Geo. A. Iseley 4 E | A. C. Bulla 15‡ | J. H. Brown 2 E |
| Rapid City, S. D. | C. I. Leedy$^{a}$ | Vacant | A. S. Holm 5 | | F. J. Austin 5 C | |
| Reading, Pa. | John H. Rorke 1 E | Walter A. Ringler 2 C | Conrad B. High 3 E | John M. Seasholtz 3 C | Ira J. Hain 14 C | |
| Red Bank, N. J. | | George W. Bray 14 E | Julia M. Keough 12 E | | William H. Lawes 17 B | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Redlands, Calif. | Theodore Krumm 2 C | C. P. Hook 21 E | C. J. Tripp 16 E | George S. Hinckley 2 C | E. B. Godfrey | |
| Reno, Nev. | C. H. Knox E | Frank Campbell E | D. W. Dunkle E | James M. Glynn M | A. F. Adams M | |
| Rensselaer, N. Y. | Katherine Sanderson 9 E | Charles S. Finkle 1 M | Katherine Sanderson 9 E | | Charles Harbison 1 M | Wesley Dearstyne M |
| Revere, Mass. | Robt. M. Copeland 36 M$^a$ | (Board of 3) E | Thomas W. Kelly* E | Clarence R. Borden 6 | Patrick C. Bruno 10 B | William F. Fouhy* M |
| Richmond, Calif. | Marie Whitesides 15 A$^a$ | J. O. Ford 16 A | I. R. Vaughn 22 A | J. A. McVittie 15 C | C. R. Blake 25 A | |
| Richmond, Ind. | George W. Coons* M$^c$ | | Albert J. Overman 4 E | W. Ray Stevens M | C. J. Hufnagel* M | |
| Richmond, Va. | Landon B. Edwards 9 C$^c$ | | H. C. Hulce 14 E | | W. B. Foster 10 M | W. B. Foster 10 M |
| Ridgefield Pk., N. J. | Herbert I. Lowe 3 E | (Board of 3) C | Herbert I. Lowe 3 E | | W. S. Reynolds B | |
| Ridgewood, N. J. | William J. Tonkin 4 E | Albert C. Ames 9 C | | Wilbur Morris 23 C | H. H. Pettit 27 B | James S. Anderson 4 E |
| River Rouge, Mich. | Raymond J. Peters 16 E | Lee Rivard 3 E | Louis Goniea 2 E | Raymond J. Peters 16 E | H. S. Broderson 2 M | Earl Beaudrie 2 M |
| Riverside, Calif. | H. W. Pierson 9 E$^a$ | | John Jahn 5 E | | H. D. Chope* B | |
| Roanoke, Va. | H. R. Yates* C$^a$ | John M. Hart 1 E | C. R. Kennett 1 E | P. H. Tucker* C | C. B. Ransome 10 A | |
| Rochester, Minn. | | Ralph I. LaPlant 4 E | Carl G. Schwarz 8 E | | Charles H. Mayo 23 C | |
| Rochester, N. H. | | (Board of 3) | J. Stacy Tripp 2 C | | Charles E. Goodwin 7 C | Forrest L. Keay 32 C |
| Rochester, N. Y. | Paul B. Aex 1 A$^c$ | Frank T. Curtin 1 A | Augustine B. Hone 3‡ | John G. Schreiner 1‡ | A. M. Johnson 3‡ | Frank X. Kelly 1 A |
| Rockford, Ill. | | (County) | H. F. Beckstrom 2 E | | N. C. Bullock 2 M | Prudence Ross |
| Rock Hill, S. C. | David Lyle 1 E | | B. R. Neely 2 C | T. C. Marshall 2 C | Nye W. Allen 1 C | |
| Rock Island, Ill. | | Charles Nicholls 1 E | Carl J. L. Wessel E | F. M. Brown | Earnest Russ 8 M | |
| Rockville Centre, N. Y. | | George H. Wetjen 8 B | Ervin D. Johnson 8 B | | A. D. Jaques 20 B | |
| Rocky Mount, N. C. | J. E. Johnson 2 C | John Innes 5 A | J. E. Johnson 2 C | A. S. Lyon 4 A | Roy Norton 3 B | Mrs. R. D. Bulluck 3 C |
| Rome, Ga. | E. L. Cantrell 2 A | A. K. Dooley 2 A | E. L. Cantrell 2 A | O. M. Lanham 2 C | A. H. Porter* A | O. M. Lanham 2 C |
| Rome, N. Y. | Lynn C. Butts 15 E | | Lynn C. Butts 15 E | | Lewis N. Eames 7‡ | James A. Spargo, Jr. 5 M |
| Roselle, N. J. | Edward C. Moffitt 1 E | George F. Dravis 3 E | Edward C. Moffitt 1 E | Jacob F. Ostrander 27 | P. A. Proudfoot | Charles L. Coble 1 M |
| Roswell, N. Mex. | | | Joe Dekker 1 M | | W. W. Phillips 8 M | |
| Royal Oak, Mich. | Catherine T. Currie 9 C | Duncan McRae 9 C | Minnie N. Reeves 12 C | E. M. Shafter 3 C | D. A. Cameron* C | E. M. Shafter 3 C |
| Rutherford, N. J. | C. D. Pickett* M | (Board of 3) 7 M | Scott D. Staples* E | | Marine Dunn | |
| Rutland, Vt. | Arthur W. Perkins 8 E | (Board of 3) 6 | Will L. Davis 40 E | H. A. Colburn 1 M | C. A. Cole 7 M | F. H. Dignau 8 M |
| Sacramento, Calif. | A. O. Hoover 1 A$^c$ | E. H. Nelson 1 A | J. H. Stephens 7 C | E. J. Plato 13 A | H. F. True 5 A | |
| Saginaw, Mich. | Albert Louden 1 C$^c$ | Arthur Carman 2 C | Edward Scott, Jr. 2 E | | Frank A. Poole C | |
| St. Augustine, Fla. | Charles E. Kettle 5 C$^a$ | Buel Pinkham 8 C | John P. Mack 4 C | Eugene Masters 3 C | S. J. Wolf 1 A | Eugene Masters 3 C |
| St. Charles, Mo. | John C. Platz 4 E | H. D. Zumbehl 8 E | A. J. Moerschel 4 E | Clarence G. Wessler 1 C | L. E. Belding 1 M | |
| St. Cloud, Minn. | Fred C. Lindt 3 E | Frank Jung 5 C | Fred C. Lindt 3 E | R. E. Borrowman 5 C | Math Hamilton 3 C | Phil Collignon 3 E |
| St. Joseph, Mo. | T. M. Longmuir 3 M | C. A. Buis 4 M | Phil J. Welch 3 E | H. L. Graham 5 B | A. J. Smith 5 B | Mildred Muir 8 B |
| St. Louis, Mo. | Louis Nolte 18 E$^c$ | Ralph W. Coale 2 M | Henry C. Menne 2 E | Victor P. Roach 2 M | R. L. Thompson 2 M | Joseph M. Darst 2 M |
| St. Paul, Minn. | H. F. Goodrich 3 E | E. A. Young 15 M | Axel Peterson 1 E | H. W. Austin 1 M | R. B. J. Schock 1‡ | W. W. Skinner 1 B |
| St. Petersburg, Fla. | Frank Wilson 4 C | J. C. Donehoo 3 A | Frank Wilson 4 C | John T. Andrews 5‡ | J. N. Hornbaker 8 C | Robert Walden 3 A |
| Salem, Mass. | John V. Cook 9 M | (Board of 3) M | Charles G. F. Coker 7 M | David W. Hamilton 4 M | John J. McGrath 17 B | William O. Safford 13 M |
| Salem, Ohio | K. L. Webster 3 E$^a$ | | Vincent C. Judge 2 E | | R. T. Holzbach 2 B | |
| Salem, Ore. | | | C. O. Rice E | A. Warren Jones E | Vernon A. Douglas C | |
| Salina, Kans. | | | H. H. Eberhardt 20 A | | L. L. Shoemaker 8 A | |
| Salinas, Calif. | | F. E Heple 2 C | F. A. Abbott 14 C | | Marie K. Fidel 3 C | |
| Salisbury, Md. | A. M. Balla | W. F. Bounds 20 C | J. R. Laws 4 M | J. R. Laws 4 M | S. H. Hurdle 4 M | |
| Salisbury, N. C. | H. C. Holmes 3 C | | Mrs. W. F. Whitt 3 C | H. C. Holmes 3 C | C. W. Armstrong 12 B | Mrs. M. O. Linton 10‡ |
| Salt Lake City, Utah | Louis Marcus 3 E | | Milton E. Lipman 3 M | Frank S. Emery 3 M | L. E. Viko 3‡ | |
| San Angelo, Tex. | E. F. Riedel 6 A$^a$ | Sam Lawhon 9 A | E. F. Riedel 6 A | E. E. Lowrie 5 A | B. T. Brown 3 A | |
| San Antonio, Tex. | Walter Tatsch 7 M$^a$ | Frank H. Bushick 12 E | A. R. Dietzmann 3 C | Ed. G. Siebrecht 2 M | W. A. King 12 M | |

## Table VIII-B.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Chief Finance Officer | City Assessor | City Treasurer | Purchasing Agent | Health Officer | Director of Public Welfare |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| San Benito, Tex. | | L. E. Stanley 7 M | | | N. D. Monger‡ | |
| San Bernardino, Calif. | C. C. Wood 9‡ | (County) | Albert A. Burcham 9 E | C. C. Wood 9‡ | W. D. Lenker 2 M | |
| San Diego, Calif. | G. F. Waterbury 4 C[a] | James H. Johnson 4 E | Robert C. Lindsay 2 A | Harry J. Schaper 3 A | Alex M. Lesem 14 A | (County) |
| Sandusky, Ohio | Carl F. Breining 9 C | | Carl F. Breining 9 C | R. L. J. Wagar 1 C | F. M. Houghtaling 13 B | Robt. L. J. Wagar 1 C |
| Sanford, Fla. | F. S. Lamson 7 C[a] | F. S. Lamson 7 C | | F. S. Lamson 5 C | J. N. Tolar 7 C | Helen Morse |
| San Francisco, Calif. | Leonard S. Leavy 3 M[c] | Russell L. Wolden 9 E | Duncan Matheson 6 E | T. A. Brooks 3‡ | J. G. Geiger 4‡ | Eugenie Schenk 6‡ |
| San Jose, Calif. | Roy E. Walter 18 E[a] | (County) | H. Ahlman 2 C | C. B. Goodwin 14 C | H. C. Brown 14 A | |
| San Leandro, Calif. | | E. F. Hutchings 9 E | A. J. Silva 3 E | A. E. Pelton C | I. O. Church A | |
| San Mateo, Calif. | C. E. Piatt[a] | E. W. Foster 14 | C. A. Ginnever 8 E | E. P. Wilsey 5 C | J. A. Warburton 2 A | |
| Santa Ana, Calif. | Lloyd H. Banks 10 C[a] | (County) | Margaret Esau 8 E | Lloyd H. Banks 10 C | Kenneth Sutherland | (County) |
| Santa Barbara, Calif. | George D. Geib 5 M[a] | W. W. Smith 14 E | Bernice Herd 6 M | C. E. Hasse 17 M | William H. Eaton 11 M | |
| Santa Cruz, Calif. | | | S. A. Evans 24 C | | J. T. Harrington 4 C | |
| Santa Fe, N. Mex. | Wiltz Hymel 4 E | W. J. Rounseville 3 C | W. J. Rounseville 3 C | W. J. Rounseville 3 C | Lucas Sena | |
| Santa Monica, Calif. | T. D. Plumer 1 E | T. D. Plumer 1 E | T. D. Plumer 1 E | C. C. Crawford* C | William H. Carter 3 E | Wm. H. Carter 3 E |
| Santa Rosa, Calif. | McBride Smith 8 E | John Hawkes | McBride Smith 8 E | Fred C. Steiner | E. J. Helgren 12 A | L. B. McGuire 2 A |
| Sapulpa, Okla. | W. C. Kohlenberg 3 A[a] | | T. H. Stuart 3 C | | J. B. Lampton* A | |
| Saratoga Springs, N. Y. | Mary A. Mulqueen 8 E | J. M. Cavanaugh‡ | Mary A. Mulqueen 8 E | Charles Lynch 1 E | F. Ressigine 3‡ | |
| Saugus, Mass. | Edward Gibbs, Jr.[a] | | Harold Dodge | | Dr. Davis | George Ames |
| Sault Ste. Marie, Mich. | S. G. Carlton C[a] | S. G. Carlton 20 C | R. R. Reinhart 1 C | Mark Sheply 8 C | E. A. Cornell 5 A | Ethleen Rowe 13 |
| Savannah, Ga. | E. R. Banks 18 M[c] | E. F. Lovell, Jr. 15 M | R. S. Carr 7 M | W. G. Logan 2 M | V. H. Bassett 12 M | |
| Schenectady, N. Y. | Leon G. Dibble 17 E[c] | (Board of 4) E | Walter C. Whitmyre 15 E | G. Conrad Wartman 1 M | Joseph B. Garlick 2 M | William Fagal 1 M |
| Scranton, Pa. | Edward Eisele 29 E[c] | C. G. Chappell 2 M | Fred A. Westpfahl 1 M | | Arthur E. Davis 1 M | |
| Seattle, Wash. | H. W. Carroll 27 E[c] | | H. L. Collier 6 E | P. Fredrickson 1 M | Frank M. Carroll 2 M | Hattie M. Patterson 1‡ |
| Sedalia, Mo. | Tom E. Dugan 1 E | John A. Collins 1 E | Mrs. A. G. Ferguson 1 E | | Tom L. Bohon* M | Bess Moerschel B |
| Selma, Ala. | V. B. Atkins 2 E | (County) | H. I. Shelley 35 C | L. P. Burns* C | J. F. Connor 20 C | |
| Seminole, Okla. | | | | | E. R. McAllister | |
| Shaker Heights, Ohio | E. P. Rudolph 4 M | | | T. E. Cook 4 M | Paul M. Spurney 3 M | |
| Shamokin, Pa. | George W. Shade 2 C | (Board of 12) | F. A. Gable 1 C | | F. A. Zeiser 10 B | |
| Sharon, Pa. | H. T. Stewart 1 C | Wm. B. Nightwine 14 C | W. A. Maitland 3 E | J. B. Goldberg 3 E | Joseph Hildebrand 3 C | |
| Shawnee, Okla. | Charles C. Porter 4 C[a] | (County) | Cora M. Stevens 15 C | T. E. Thompson 5 C | L. J. Neal 2 A | |
| Sheboygan, Wis. | Wilbur Brehm 6 E[c] | Edward F. Oehler 14 E | E. F. Stolzenburg 6 E | Fred Hensel 4 M | G. J. Hildebrand 6 B | G. J. Hildebrand 6 B |
| Shelby, N. C. | Bessie Reinhardt[a] | | Miss Reeves Forney 3 M | | J. S. Dorton 8 C | |
| Shelbyville, Ind. | | | Lulu Porterfield* 2 E | | Paul R. Tindall* M | |
| Shelton, Conn. | | Charles D. Glover 2 E | Edward L. Miller 2 E | | Edward J. Finn M | Peter G. McGivney M |
| Shenandoah, Pa. | Annie Schaeffer | J. V. Tierney | Annie Schaeffer | | Claude Davis | |
| Sherman, Tex. | W. Morgan Works 3 C | Roscoe Russell 20 A | Sales Omohundro 3 | W. Morgan Works 3 C | C. D. Strother 2 A | W. Morgan Works 3 C |
| Shorewood, Wis. | Paul R. Krueger 24 E | Frank F. Schultz 19 E | Paul R. Krueger 24 E | Harry A. Schmitt 4 B | Jerome M. Jekel 1 B | |
| Shreveport, La. | John M. Ford 5 E | | J. T. Tanner 5 C | Leon Booth 1 C | W. J. Sandidge 1 C | |
| Sioux City, Iowa | W. E. True 35‡[a] | P. C. Cockrill 10 C | C. A. Carlson 25‡ | | W. S. Petty 5 M | |
| Sioux Falls, S. D. | A. N. Graff 1 E | G. R. Eliker 3 M | L. S. Hetland 1 M | | E. E. Gage 1 M | A. N. Graff 1 E |
| Somerville, Mass. | Francis J. Daley 5 C[a] | Maurice F. Ahearn 5 M | Joseph D. Mawhinney 1C | | Laurence S. Howard 30‡ | Wm. E. Copithorne 16‡ |
| South Bend, Ind. | Fred Woodward 4 M | | John F. DeHaven 2 E | | F. N. Carter 4 M | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Southbridge, Mass. | Joseph E. Desrosier[a] | | | | Albert R. Brown | |
| South Gate, Calif. | William Rempel 3 E | | A. F. Ullrich 3 E | Guy F. Nevill 3 C | Hal E. Hazel | Earl L. Fike 1 E |
| South Milwaukee, Wis. | H. W. Daehling 2 E | C. E. Fowle 2 C | Elme Welbes 2 E | H. W. Daehling 2 E | R. Moray 2 E | |
| South Orange, N. J. | | John F. O'Brien 2 M | Howard S. Watkins 2 | Howard S. Watkins 1 | A. C. Benedict 12 | |
| South Pasadena, Calif. | H. A. Harrison 8 | | H. W. Huntzinger 6 E | Nettie A. Hewitt 14 E | Albert Supple* | Mrs. C. J. Pearson 16 |
| South Portland, Me. | | (Board of 3) C | H. A. Brinkerhoff C | H. A. Brinkerhoff C | R. L. Huntress A | Cecil Pullen A |
| South River, N. J. | Guy Gilbert 4 E | Russel Howarth 4 M | | | W. F. Moluski 3 M | |
| South St. Paul, Minn. | | George Carpenter 2 E | Joseph Jerhoff 2 E | Charles Zeman 2 C | O. S. Ely 2 C | Fern Chase 1 B |
| Spartanburg, S. C. | T. K. Fletcher‡ | (County) | T. K. Fletcher 2 C | T. K. Fletcher 3 C | W. O. Wrightson 15 C | |
| Spokane, Wash. | H. D. Dearling 6 C[a] | | H. F. Tabb 5‡ | C. T. Bogart 19 C | Ralph Hendricks 15 | |
| Springfield, Ill. | Ray E. Simmons 8‡[c] | | Charles A. Schuppe 4‡ | Harry B. Luers 8 E | C. W. Milligan 4‡ | |
| Springfield, Mass. | Albert E. Neale 6 C[a] | (Board of 3) C | George W. Rice 3 E | | (Vacant) | John F. Madden 6 B |
| Springfield, Mo. | B. E. Jared 1‡[a] | John W. Bass 5 E | H. E. Bennett 1 E | | R. W. Langston 3 E | |
| Springfield, Ohio | J. M. Stritch 2 C[a] | | R. L. McIntire 1 C | P. A. Lewis 1 C | O. M. Craven 11 A | |
| Stamford, Conn. | Joseph A. Boyle 1 M | Justin A. McCarthy 6 B | Joseph A. Boyle 1 M | Vincent Callahan 1‡ | Raymond D. Fear 11 M | J. T. Hanrahan 3 E |
| Statesville, N. C. | H. H. Yount 2 C | | H. H. Yount 2 C | | J. M. Alexander 6 C | |
| Staunton, Va. | Miss C. V. Herndon 4 A[a] | S. D. Holsinger | H. E. Baylor 1 E | J. C. Ruff 1 C | J. F. Fulton 12 C | Miss E. W. Brooke 1 C |
| Steelton, Pa. | | | Alfred F. Fries 1 C | | E. G. Butler 40 B | |
| Sterling, Ill. | J. H. Linn 8 E | | W. L. Hendricks*‡ | | W. I. Carolus 8 M | |
| Steubenville, Ohio | J. A. Cartledge 9 E[a] | | Paul S. Linn 5 E | | J. A. Pizzoferrato 7 B | John A. Madigan 1 M |
| Stevens Point, Wis. | Peter Walraven 5 C | Joseph A. Peck 12 A | Eleanore Glodoske 3 A | Peter Walraven 5 C | F. R. Krembs 6 A | |
| Stockton, Calif. | J. P. Campbell 12 C[a] | J. P. Campbell 21 C | M. E. Page 4 C | Van. L. Shaljian 12 A | John J. Sippy | |
| Stoneham, Mass. | Charles A. Owen 10 C | (Board of 3) E | Simeon C. Fuller 15 E | | Geo. A. Hinchcliffe 8 B | |
| Stratford, Conn. | William H. Shea 12 A | William H. Shea 12 A | William H. Shea 12 A | William H. Shea 1 A | DeRuyter Howland 15‡ | MacLaren Stevenson 8 A |
| Streator, Ill. | Paul H. Patterson 4 E | Elmer Howell 1 E | John F. Lynch 4 M | | Arthur Gaff 17 C | |
| Struthers, Ohio | John F. Pearce 1 E[a] | | Cora B. Boozel 9 E | John F. Pearce 1 E | L. A. Adams 9 M | |
| Suffolk, Va. | Jack W. Nurney | | George S. Swain 1 E | J. W. Holton 5 A | C. H. Dawson 8† | T. J. Eley |
| Summit, N. J. | C. S. Hickok 2 C | (Board of 3) C | C. S. Hickok 2 C | Fred Mort C. | Dr. Dengler B | |
| Sumter, S. C. | | | S. K. Rowland 1 C | J. A. Raffield 1 C | G. R. Kitchen 4 C | |
| Sunbury, Pa. | C. A. Deppen 9 E[c] | Charles Romberger 1 C | R. E. Jones 9 E | | Carl Inkrote 1 C | A. B. Shipe 1 E |
| Superior, Wis. | B. O. Bergeson 16 M[c] | A. A. Lenroot 2 M | W. J. Keaough 2 M | E. R. Bowser 2 M | P. G. McGill 2 M | |
| Swampscott, Mass. | Horace R. Parker 10 C | Edw. A. Maxfield 32 E | James W. Libby 16 E | | Clarence W. Horton 20 B | Harry E. Cahoon 21 E |
| Sweetwater, Tex. | W. H. Whaley 4 C | W. H. Whaley 4 C | W. H. Whaley 4 C | S. H. Bothwell 7 C | E. W. Prothro 3 A | |
| Swissvale, Pa. | | | W. D. Bowers 16 C | W. J. Brisbin 3 M | S. L. Glasgow 3 C | |
| Syracuse, N. Y. | N. W. Markson M[c] | Clifford Goes | Chas. A. Latterner 6 E | A. Smingler, Jr. 11 M | Geo. C. Ruhland 10 M | Leon H. Abbott 4 M |
| Tacoma, Wash. | T. A. Swayze E[c] | (County) | C. V. Fawcett 5 E | Ben R. Nichols 8 C | S. M. Creswell 4 M | George A. Smitley 1 E |
| Tallahassee, Fla. | | B. H. Bridges 24 C | B. H. Bridges 24 C | William R. Galt 11 C | L. J. Graves 4 A | |
| Tamaqua, Pa. | John West 12 E | (Board of 5) E | S. R. Beard 30 C | | Lamont Perrine 12 B | |
| Tampa, Fla. | George V. Booker 2 M[c] | W. Fred Steuart E | Thomas C. Keller 19 M | Thomas Hudgings 2 M | J. R. McEachern 3 M | |
| Taunton, Mass. | John E. Fitzgerald 19[a] | Joseph P. McKenna E | Lewis A. Hodges 23 E | | J. I. McNamara 3 E | Emory J. Malo 1 |
| Taylor, Pa. | | | Ralph White 2 C | Thomas McAndrew 2 C | E. E. Edwards 4 C | |
| Temple, Tex. | W. B. Hoyle 3 C[c] | W. B. Hoyle 3 C | W. B. Hoyle 3 C | N. A. Ensor 1 C | B. F. Lee 1 C | |
| Terre Haute, Ind. | Clem J. Richards 1‡[c] | (County) | James J. Fagin 1 E | Clem J. Richards 1‡ | Morris VanCleave | |
| Texarkana, Ark. | | | W. C. Kuhl 2 E | | Harry E. Murry M | |
| Texarkana, Tex. | E. W. Godbold[a] | A. B. Jordan 4 E | E. W. Godbold 1 C | G. D. Garrett 3 E | C. A. Smith C | |
| Thomasville, Ga. | H. L. Key* E | (Board of 3) C | R. J. Hawthorn 2 E | | J. R. Dykes 1‡ | |

## Table VIII-B.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Chief Finance Officer | City Assessor | City Treasurer | Purchasing Agent | Health Officer | Director of Public Welfare |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Thomasville, N. C. | R. M. Cooksey 12 C | | B. H. Harris 17 C | R. M. Cooksey 12 C | A. C. Gambrill B | R. M. Cooksey 12 C |
| Tiffin, Ohio | Albert J. Hafley 2 E[a] | | V. M. Heebsh 1 M | | J. A. Gosling B | Mark T. Wertz M |
| Toledo, Ohio | Charles H. Austin 5 M | (County) | A. W. Weber 1 M | Cecil Debth 3 M | Basil B. Brim 1 M | Charles Mathews* M |
| Tonawanda, N. Y. | | George Hutchison 9 C | C. W. Schulmeister 8 E | | R. H. Wilcox 4 B | |
| Topeka, Kans. | R. F. Agard 6‡[a] | | O. N. Berry 6‡ | | F. P. Helm 3‡ | H. C. Snyder 2 E |
| Torrington, Conn. | F. M. Travis‡ | (Board of 3) E | John N. Brooks 12 E | | Elias Pratt‡ | |
| Traverse City, Mich. | J. E. Ehrenberger 2 E | Gregor Gerst 2 C | George G. Bates 7 C | | G. A. Holliday 20 C | R. H. Smith 4 E |
| Trenton, N. J. | Edward W. Lee 25 C[c] | (Board of 2)‡ | Harry E. Evans 26‡ | | Alton S. Fell 20‡ | B. J. Walsh 2 C |
| Trinidad, Colo. | James Ingles[a] | | Alice E. Moore 2 E | | B. M. Cawley 2‡ | |
| Troy, N. Y. | L. J. Collins 3 E[c] | John W. Byrne 5 M | John F. Shannon 5 E | John L. Kelly 7 | James H. Flynn 6 M | Nora A. Burke 7 M |
| Tucson, Ariz. | C. E. Pequignot[a] | C. E. Pequignot 9 M | Charles C. Irvin 2 M | R. E. Butler 4 M | L. H. Howard 4 M | |
| Tulsa, Okla. | Earl E. Logan E | | Clarence White M | W. F. Graham 3 | H. J. Billington M | |
| Turtle Creek, Pa. | Philip Jones | Thomas Roberts | W. H. Senmurs 2 E | E. M. Allan | M. Emanuel | |
| Tuscaloosa, Ala. | D. O. Parker 3 E | George D. Johnson 20 E | Glenn Foster 22 C | H. M. McLeod 4 C | A. A. Kirk 12 B | J. C. Pearson 4 E |
| Two Rivers, Wis. | J. P. Hoffman Jr.[a] | P. M. Feuerstein 9 A | Joseph Doleysh 8 A | | A. P. Zlatnik 9 A | |
| Tyler, Tex. | Lee H. Powell 9 C | S. A. Shelton 22 A | Guy V. McNallie 3 A | G. V. McNallie 3 A | A. Woldert 18 A | |
| Union City, N. J. | Lewis B. Eastmead E | (Board of 3)‡ | William G. Weller 5‡ | | G. P. Curtis 5‡ | H. J. Thourot 4 E |
| Uniontown, Pa. | C. J. LaClair 5 E | S. F. Nabors 1 C | J. D. Kerfoot 3 E | C. J. LaClair 5 E | W. C. Hall 16 C | |
| University City, Mo. | B. F. McMorris 2 M[c] | | E. B. Connor 2 M | E. L. Bruns 6 M | O. P. Hampton 4 M | |
| Urbana, Ill. | H. M. Gray 2 E | George A. Keller 2 E | Frances I. Corbin 2 E | | W. L. Veirs M | |
| Utica, N. Y. | Thomas J. Nelson* E[c] | Frank J. Winslow 1 E | Fred. Gillmore 1 E | Charles F. Agne 1‡ | Hugh H. Shaw 15‡ | W. F. Hudson 1‡ |
| Valdosta, Ga. | T. A. Baker 2 M | | J. B. Chisholm 2 M | | E. D. King, Jr. 14 M | |
| Vallejo, Calif. | Fred H. Heegler 8 E | Geo. D. Hildreth 30 E | Mae E. Chappell 12 C | | E. A. Peterson C | E. J. Blanco 8 E |
| Valley Stream, N. Y. | | J. C. Dibble M | A. Becher M | J. Groenewold M | J. M. Quinn M | |
| Vancouver, Wash. | | | John A. Hogg 2 E | | R. W. Armstrong | |
| Vandergrift, Pa. | D. Paul Miller[a] | G. A. Whitacre 2 B | (Bank) | | J. D. Remaley 1 B | |
| Ventura, Calif. | Grace Woodruff 1 A | H. R. Morris 7 A | L. L. Spafford 2 A | D. C. McMillan* C | J. A. DeSerpa 7 A | |
| Vicksburg, Miss. | | Abe Kiersky 30 E | J. C. Hamilton 4 E | | F. M. Smith 7 B | |
| Vincennes, Ind. | Joseph I. Muentzer 5 E | | Randall Ellis | Robert E. Lind 5 M | N. E. Beckes* M | |
| Virginia, Minn. | A. E. Bickford 33‡ | F. J. Moilan 4‡ | H. R. Bucklen 5 E | | Arnold Malstrom | |
| Waco, Tex. | J. L. Smith 4 C[c] | Tom S. Hollon 6 C | (Bank) C | J. L. Smith 4 C | R. W. Crosthwait 3 C | |
| Wakefield, Mass. | Patrick H. Tenney 3 B | Chas. A. Cheney 26 E | Arthur Boardman 18 E | | David Taggart 16 B | D. P. Hogan 3 E |
| Walla Walla, Wash. | A. K. Dice | | John McGhee 22 C | A. K. Dice | A. Vanderpool 8 C | |
| Wallingford, Conn. | William Bertini 9 E[a] | | John E. Keevers 10 E | | M. T. Sheehan 10 M | Eleanore Hyatt 3‡ |
| Waltham, Mass. | Ralph C. Dow[a] | | Harlan W. Cutter 23 M | H. W. Saumsiegle 17 M | C. B. Fuller 29 M | J. T. Mulcahy 4 M |
| Warren, Ohio | B. M. Hillyer 3 E | | M. E. Hillman 5 E | | L. A. Biddlestone 17 M | |
| Warren, Pa. | H. M. Miller 6 M | (1 each ward) | W. W. Beaty 7 C | | R. N. Brown 22 | |
| Warwick, R. I. | (Vacant) | Harold P. Whyte* M | George B. Clegg* M | | William H. Dyer* M | J. H. Fletcher* M |
| Washington, D. C. | Daniel J. Donovan 15[a] | William P. Richards 26 | James R. Lusby 17 | M. C. Hargrove 22 | Edward J. Schwartz* | Elwood Street* |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Washington, Pa. | Albert Zelt | | | | Thomas W. Henderson | |
| Waterbury, Conn. | Daniel J. Leary 5 E$^c$ | John H. Crary 13 M | E. L. Tuttle 13 E | M. J. Dunn 5‡ | Edward Godfrey 9 B | Margaret Verdon*B |
| Waterloo, Iowa | Charles C. MacKay 13 C$^a$ | J. A. Townsley 12 E | Guy M. Johnson 7 E | Charles C. MacKay 13 C | J. E. Ridenour 5 M | |
| Watertown, Mass. | W. W. Norcross, Jr. 22 E | | H. W. Brigham 26 E | | F. W. Bodge 2 B | D. H. Murphy 3 C |
| Watertown, N. Y. | T. Fred Goodwin 14 A$^a$ | S. A. Humphrey 8 A | P. B. Dorr 10 A | H. B. Evans 10 A | G. B. VanDoren 7 A | Clyde Miller 2 A |
| Watertown, S. D. | Marela Hopkins 2 M$^a$ | H. D. Rice 4 M | B. H. Stover 4 M | B. N. Hagna 8 E | W. G. Magee 4 M | |
| Watertown, Wis. | A. H. Stallman 7 E$^c$ | Louis Kronitz 7 E | Louis A. Knick 11 E | | F. H. Zimmermann 1 M | |
| Waterville, Me. | Leon Tebbetts‡ | (Board of 3) C | Lewis G. Whipple C | | Arthur Daviau‡ | F. Goodrich C |
| Watervliet, N. Y. | Thomas A. Mahoney 1 M | | Thomas A. Mahoney 1 M | Edward S. Phalen 11 M | C. A. Birmingham 10 M | K. V. Moran 14 M |
| Waukegan, Ill. | John P. Wyllie 4 E | | Edw. R. Holmberg 2 E | Helen Blakeslee 2 M | J. D. Foley 4 M | |
| Waukesha, Wis. | Charles E. Hughes 1 E | Leo F. Martin 5 E | E. O. Brickson 6 E | Charles E. Hughes 1 E | F. M. Scheele 7 M | C. H. Giesselbrecht 3 M |
| Wausau, Wis. | | E. J. Ziebell 1 E | Regina E. Emter 7 E | Otto Muenchow 3 E | L. F. Bugbee 12 B | |
| Wauwatosa, Wis. | | W. F. Tubesing* E | F. Prudesch 16 E | | R. T. Hansen M | |
| Waycross, Ga. | | (Board of 3)† | Walter E. Lee 21 C | H. M. Pafford 1 C | George E. Atwood 10 C | Mrs. D. Salisbury 10 C |
| Waynesboro, Pa. | A. Stover Fitz 26 C | (County) | W. B. Hunter 6 C | | P. H. Snowberger 20 C | |
| Webster, Mass. | John E. Hickey 19 C | George Morgan 14 E | James P. Bergin 8 E | | D. F. Casey 1 B | John Morgan 2 C |
| Webster Groves, Mo. | E. F. Chapman 6 C | Fred Norris C | K. W. Howe 6 C | George E. Waite 2 C | Carl C. Irish 4 C | |
| Wellesley, Mass. | | Richard Cunningham 21 | Geo. G. S. Perkins 10 | | C. M. Hilliard 10 B | John T. Ryan 28 B |
| Wenatchee, Wash. | William H. Little 1 E | | R. P. Stowers 3‡ | | Dr. Fargher 1 C | |
| West Allis, Wis. | I. F. Knoebel 13 C | J. B. Brady 9 E | P. A. Hoffman 4 E | | C. S. Stern 3 C | |
| Westbrook, Me. | | R. F. Libby 10 M | Ralph W. Miller 8 M | | P. H. Welch 30 M | Harry V. Redden 9 M |
| West Chester, Pa. | J. B. R. Herd C | Parke Hayes 4 E | W. Minerva Davis 2‡ | | W. T. Garrett 4‡ | |
| Westerly, R. I. | | (Board of 3) E | J. M. Pendleton 43 E | | Samuel C. Webster C | C. L. Segar 3 E |
| Westfield, Mass. | Mary E. Walsh 11 C$^a$ | Herder C. Wood 10 M | R. P. McCarthy 9 C | | Charles D. Shaw 7‡ | Morrell H. Moore 14‡ |
| Westfield, N. J. | William Davies | | | | Andrew Carney | |
| West Frankfort, Ill. | | (Board of 2) M | E. McCollum M | W. M. Martin E | William T. Fife | |
| West Hartford, Conn. | H. H. Barton 12 C$^c$ | (Board of 5) | C. A. Boyce 7 C | Rodney L. Loomis 1 C | H. B. Smith* B | Rodney L. Loomis 1 C |
| West Haven, Conn. | Elmer E. Scranton | F. S. Anderson 1 C | Charles Fischer 1 E | | Bevans | Mrs. F. Heil 1‡ |
| West New York, N. J. | Joseph F. Toomey 4 | Saul Harris 9 | Daniel P. Curry 2 | | Rudolph Kunze 21 | Wilbur J. McGowan 2 |
| West Orange, N. J. | George C. Kayes 9‡ | Danield W. Gillum | George C. Kayes 9‡ | R. C. Alford 12‡ | D. E. Buckley 20‡ | B. P. Laidlaw 1 E |
| West Palm Beach, Fla. | F. M. Hannon 1 A | S. G. Trownsell 10 A | F. M. Hannon 1 A | | W. E. VanLandingham 8 A | |
| West Springfield, Mass. | Frederick P. Bagg 4 C | (Board of 3) E | Henry E. Schmuck 12 E | | John J. Lysaght 15 B | Ethyl J. MacNair 2 B |
| West Warwick, R. I. | | James W. Leighton | | | D. S. Harrop | |
| Wewoka, Okla. | Guy B. VanSandt 1 E | | M. M. Sebastian 1 B | (Board) | George H. Hunter 7 B | |
| Weymouth, Mass. | E. R. Dizer 15 C | | Edwin R. Sampson 4 E | | F. L. Doucett | C. T. Furnald 1 C |
| Wheeling, W. Va. | N. H. vonBerg 12 M | Karl Sailor 6 E | W. H. Pfarr 2 M | | R. M. Pederord 2 C | |
| White Plains, N. Y. | Richard Appel 4 | William J. Weise 10 | | Eugene Halpin, Jr. | Edward H. Marsh | John K. Bastian 3 |
| Whiting, Ind. | | | Edith E. Langenham 4 E | | B. B. Reeve 4 M | Lenna S. Ahlstrom 4 M |
| Whittier, Calif. | Debbie E. Allen 5 E | Debbie E. Allen 5 E | W. C. Pyle 3 E | | R. L. Kaufman 2‡ | |
| Wichita, Kans. | E. Worrell 9 A$^a$ | | E. M. Thomas 17 A | J. M. Pierce 1 A | J. E Wolfe 4 A | E. A. Wolfe 4 |
| Wichita Falls, Tex. | J. H. Crouch* C | W. R. Hyer 11 A | Oral Jones* C | F. M. Rugeley 14 A | John H. Fletcher* A | |
| Wilkes-Barre, Pa. | George M. Yencha 2 E$^c$ | Edward Eyerman 12 C | Frank P. Kelly 8 E | Ethylda Shelhamer 1 | Chas. B. Crittenden‡ | A. A. Bloomburg 1‡ |
| Wilkinsburg, Pa. | R. E. Miles$^c$ | | | | J. M. Snyder | |
| Williamsport, Pa. | E. H. Maitland 2 E | S. J. Webster 5 C | B. C. Bowman 3 E | | William Mollenkoph 6 C | |
| Willimantic, Conn. | E. Frank Bugbee 2 B | Arthur L. Clark 7 | Arthur L. Clark 7 | James H. Hurley 3 E | N. Spector 3‡ | E. A. Buck |
| Wilmette, Ill. | E. H. Kerr 12 M | | Harry W. Miller 8 E | E. H. Kerr 12 M | M. H. Seifert 3 M | |
| Wilmington, Del. | Zack W. Wells 1 M$^a$ | (Board of 2) M | William V. Lynch 2 E | | J. Butler 2 M | George E. Black |

TABLE VIII-B.—DIRECTORY OF CITY OFFICIALS IN ALL CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued

| City | Chief Finance Officer | City Assessor | City Treasurer | Purchasing Agent | Health Officer | Director of Public Welfare |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wilmington, N. C. | W. Louis Fisher 6 E | | J. R. Benson 5 C | W. Louis Fisher 6 E | A. H. Elliott 4‡ | J. R. Hollis 4 |
| Wilson, N. C. | | (County) | W. E. Warren 4 C | W. M. Wiggins 2 C | W. H. Anderson 4 C | Jeanette Granger 8 C |
| Winchester, Mass. | | (Board of 3) E | Harrie Y. Nutter 11 E | | Maurice Dinneen 16 B | Earle E. Andrews 2 E |
| Winchester, Va. | W. A. Baker 5 E | C. P. McVicar 1 E | W. A. Baker 5 E | Arthur M. Field* C | L. M. Allen 4 B | Margaret Hurst 2 B |
| Winnetka, Ill. | Elizabeth Uhe 1 A | | Ralph M. Snyder 3 C | Earle Henderson 5 A | H. A. Orvis 8 A | |
| Winona, Minn. | | Jacob L. Mayer E | Otto P. Pietsch E | | W. V. Lindsay | Mrs. E. Eifealdt‡ |
| Winston-Salem, N. C. | F. J. Peterson, Jr. 6 C | | W. J. Hamner 5 C | F. J. Peterson, Jr. 6 C | R. L. Carlton 18 C | |
| Winthrop, Mass. | I. W. Crowell 5 C | Frank W. Tucker 8 E | Harry W. Aiken 27 E | | Wm. D. Childress B | |
| Woburn, Mass. | Hugh F. Gilgun 3 C[a] | John T. O'Neil | M. J. Curran C | | Edward F. Gorman B | Edward F. Gorman B |
| Woonsocket, R. I. | | (Board of 3) E | James W. Quinn 4 E | | James P. O'Brien E | Bernard Kane 2 E |
| Wooster, Ohio | Helen R. Walter 3 E[a] | | J. Edwin Johnson 3 E | George Allspaugh 1 B | W. G. Rhoten B | |
| Worcester, Mass. | Henry A. Allen 13 C[a] | (Board of 3) C | Harold J. Tunison 15 C | | Peter O'Shea 3 B | Gerhard Becker 12 B |
| Wyandotte, Mich. | | Wm. A. McClenahen 4 E | J. T. McWhirter 4 E | Lawrence J. LaCourse 4 | Earl H. Engel 2 M | Lucille Brown 6 B |
| Xenia, Ohio | A. V. Perrill[a] | | W. B. Fraver 6 C | | A. D. DeHaven 12 A | Karl Babb |
| Yakima, Wash. | Ray Washburn 3 E | | F. F. Herring M | Ray Washburn 3 E | Lloyd Moffitt M | George W. Clark 3 E |
| Yonkers, N. Y. | James E. Hushion 3 E | Timothy Murray 13 M | | Arthur I. Miller 3‡ | C. Buckmaster 14 M | N. J. Ebbitt 3 M |
| York, Pa. | | R. O. Stallsmith 15 C | Wm. H. Reynolds 7 E | | J. Frank Small 20 C | |
| Youngstown, Ohio | Hugh D. Hindman 3 M | Hugh D. Hindman | | Ferd Flood 3 M | C. H. Beight 3 M | C. H. Beight 3 M |
| Ypsilanti, Mich. | | D. F. Comstock 3 E | Mabel Stadtmiller 10 C | | B. M. Harris 1 M | |
| Zanesville, Ohio. | Henry F. Stemm 7 E[a] | | William Decker 1 C | Georgiana Lyle 1 B | Harry Dunn 1 M | |

## Table VIII-C

## DIRECTORY OF CITY OFFICIALS IN ALL CITIES OVER 10,000

Name, length of service, and method of selecting city officials as reported in February, 1935. Length of service in present position to nearest year is indicated by figure following the name; an asterisk (*) indicates less than one year's service. Letters after names: "E" indicates elected official; "A" appointed by city manager; "B" appointed by board other than council; "C" appointed by city council; "M" appointed by mayor; ‡ indicates appointed officials, but the appointing agency was not reported. In column "Director of Public Works," † indicates title is superintendent of streets. In column "Parks and Recreation Director," letter "p" indicates superintendent of parks, "r" recreation director, and "s" employment on seasonal basis.

| City | Police Chief | Fire Chief | Director of Public Works | Water Works Superintendent | Parks and Recreation Director |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aberdeen, S. D. | W. J. Goetz 1 B | E. I. Kingsley 20 B | W. W. Mathews 1 B | J. G. Colahan 2 B | S. H. Anderson 15 B p |
| Aberdeen, Wash. | George S. Dean 20 M | Charles A. Borum 20 M | J. C. Leitch M | S. C. Watkins 23 M | Peter Questi 2 B p |
| Abilene, Tex. | Ruck Sibley 5 E | J. Ray Roe 2 M | J. M. Roundtree† | R. L. Young 2 M | J. D. Burns 2 M p |
| Ada, Okla. | Somer Jones 2 M | E. C. Haley 12 M | J. D. Willoughby 2 E | W. P. Armstrong 2 E | C. E. Cunning 2 C p |
| Adams, Mass. | Edward H. Cassidy C | Charles Hiser E | Frank Wiethauper C | Howard Kaiser C | |
| Adrian, Mich. | Arch T. Wilson 2 E | H. A. Whitney 20 C | Fred Smart 14 C | Fred Smart 14 C | W. D. Aspinwall 6 E p |
| Akron, Ohio | Frank Boss 5 M | William H. Woehler 4 M | E. A. Kemmler 1 M | W. R. LaDue 3 M | W. W. Milar 1 M p |
| Alameda, Calif. | Vern Smith 4 A | Thomas Lane 2 A | G. E. Sperbeck† | John S. Longwell | Charles Schwamonberg 2 A p |
| Albany, Ga. | C. Ray 6 C | D. W. Brosnan 24 C | J. Fred Smith† | E. B. Adams‡ | W. Carl Smith 3‡ p |
| Albany, N. Y. | David Smurl 10‡ | Michael J. Fleming 10‡ | Kenneth W. Marsh 4 M | Frank J. Cassidy 10‡ | Wellington B. Clark 13Mp |
| Albert Lea, Minn. | Miles Norton 1 A | Alex Larson 5 A | C. V. Jones 1 A | C. V. Jones 1 A | Herb Schlagel 5 A p |
| Albuquerque, N. Mex. | Patrick O'Grady 26 A | W. A. Westerfeld 4 A | J. T. Rice† | Peter Stewart 3 A | |
| Alexandria, La. | F. E. David 1 M | R. A. Neff 20 M | N. G. Bilbray† | S. B. Pearce 12 C | J. A. Rachal 16 C p |
| Alexandria, Va. | John S. Arnold 4 A | James M. Duncan, Jr. 11 A | | H. C. Richards | |
| Alhambra, Calif. | M. S. Spencer‡ | F. A. Bovet‡ | E. A. Stellar 4 E | John Clay‡ | C. W. Winter‡p |
| Aliquippa, Pa. | W. L. Ambrose 3 C | C. B. Ransom 24 C | C. A. Dinsmore 10 C | A. K. Fitzer 24 C | |
| Allentown, Pa. | Frank D. Beary 3 M | Edgar W. Wolf 8 C | Henry K. Bauman 3 E | William R. Schnabel 15‡ | Irene Welty 10 C r |
| Alliance, Ohio | Harry L. Stark 7 M | J. E. Held 18 M | Ira Stevens† | John O. Stanley 20 M | E. E. Kidwell 8 B p |
| Alpena, Mich. | Fred Stinson 5 A | R. E. Wilson 19 A | A. M. Hopperstead 1 M | George McKenzie 12 A | A. M. Hopperstead 1 M p |
| Alton, Ill. | James F. Hart 2 M | John Tisius 3 M | Ed. Evans 2 | | August Dorman 20 B p |
| Altoona, Pa. | H. S. Carey 1 C | T. W. Alleman 32 C | Thomas Stewart † | Haven S. Ale 5 C | Robert H. Wolfe 3 C r |
| Amarillo, Tex. | W. R. McDowell 5 A | G. B. Cooper 4 A | H. R. Smith 2 C | Robert Andrews 8 A | C. H. Fitz 2 A p |
| Ambridge, Pa. | Andrew Bires 1 ‡ | A. G. Fisher 1 | Henry Smith† | Edward Taggart 16 | |
| Ames, Iowa | W. J. Cure 16 M | L. R. Morris 11 A | W. T. Hussong† | C. O. Alexander 11 A | |
| Amesbury, Mass. | Wm. S. Gillespie 2 C | James E. Feltham 33 C | Fred W. Merill† | Edward T. Waltz 18 B | |
| Amsterdam, N. Y. | William E. Cline E | James Stewart M | Clarence Heslan 1 E | Clarence Heslan 1 E | Allen Edmunds B r |
| Anaconda, Mont. | T. L. Cullen 13 M | Henry Quane 9 M | John L. Hamill† | H. M. Johnson | D. H. Beary rs |

## Table VIII-C.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Police Chief | Fire Chief | Director of Public Works | Water Works Superintendent | Parks and Recreation Director |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anaheim, Calif. | James S. Bouldin 10 M | R. Nyboe 12 M | John Cook 3 C | Vard W. Hannum 16 M | Rudolph Boysen 6 M pr |
| Anderson, Ind. | Joseph Carney 2 M | Frank Clem* M | Herman Biest* M | W. J. Norton 5 M | Emory Jackson 5 M p |
| Anderson, S. C. | W. W. Driskell 15 C | A. S. Mauldin 3 C | J. F. Patterson† | R. L. Switenberg | |
| Annapolis, Md. | William Curry 6 C | Jesse A. Fisher 14 C | W. H. Vansant† | T. Roland Brown 6 M | |
| Ann Arbor, Mich. | Lewis W. Fohey 2 B | Charles Andrews 27 B | | Harrison H. Caswell 4 B | Eli A. Gallup 16 B p |
| Anniston, Ala. | N. B. Pollard 2 C | E. E. Mayes 2 C | H. P. Harris† | E. E. Knowlton | |
| Ansonia, Conn. | John J. Mahoney | Theodore M. Terry 2‡ | Thomas F. Pratt 2‡ | Theodore L. Bristol | Andrew F. Nolan 1‡ r |
| Appleton, Wis. | George T. Prim 16 B | George P. McGillan 33 B | | William Gallaher 2 B | Ph. Kreutzer B p |
| Ardmore, Okla. | D. H. Dunn 4 A | Frank Jennings 16 A | F. A. Richmond† | Ancel Love 14 A | Ancel Love 14 A p |
| Arkansas City, Kans. | Lester Richardson 1 A | H. E. McCullough 4 A | D. A. Lawhe† | Clyde B. King 4‡ | C. O. Brock 4 A p |
| Arlington, Mass. | Archibald F. Bullock 4 C | Daniel B. Tierney 12 C | Edward O'Brien† | | (Board of 3) 3 E p |
| Arnold, Pa. | Sherman Hill 4 C | Joe Brunesay 2‡ | | James Griffith‡ | Joe Carroll C p |
| Asbury Park, N. J. | Alfred N. Giles 1 C | William S. Taggart 12 C | William P. Strickland 1 A | Robert Bartley | |
| Asheville, N. C. | W. J. Everett 2 A | A. L. Duckett 15 A | P. L. Threlkeld 2 A | W. E. Rankin 4 A | Weldon Weir 8 A p |
| Ashland, Ky. | C. F. Howard 4‡ | Burris Hensley 19‡ | C. D. O'Neill 1 A | William G. Powell 1 A | William G. Powell 1 A p |
| Ashland, Ohio | H. D. Fetzer 2 M | Charles L. Clark 2 M | W. Art Mason 2 E | A. H. Kennell 2‡ | E. B. Hettinger 2 M pr |
| Ashland, Wis. | Elmer Sanders 2 B | C. S. Markeson 10 B | George S. Cook† | J. A. Snow | Charles Maslowski 22 M p |
| Ashtabula, Ohio | A. J. Kane 25 A | Ray Mahan 8 A | J. W. Green† | A. T. Faulkner | |
| Astoria, Ore. | J. K. Acton 6 A | C. E. Foster 8 A | H. M. McCallister† | H. M. McCallister 12 A | H. M. McCallister 3 A p |
| Atchison, Kans. | W. C. Linville 12 A | H. N. Sowers 22 A | E. E. Hellener 12 A | L. L. Weatherford | LaVerne Stucker 2 A p |
| Athens, Ga. | E. W. Wood* | E. F. Lester 5 | Jack Watson† | J. G. Beacham 5 M | |
| Athol, Mass. | Patrick J. Murphy 24 C | Ernest L. Smith 1 C | James G. Cotton† | Frank P. Hall 14 B | R. T. Lincoln 5 E p |
| Atlanta, Ga. | T. O. Sturdivant 4 C | O. J. Parker 2 C | Clarke Donaldson 6 E | W. Zode Smith 25 E | George Simons 4 C p |
| Atlantic City, N. J. | James A. McMenamin 1 | Joseph H. Leeds 6 | William F. Casey 1 C | Lincoln VanGilder 30 | William Sykes 5 p |
| Attleboro, Mass. | George D. Rapport* M | Fred A. Clark‡ | John O. Taber, Jr. M | John O. Taber, Jr. M | John E. Anderson B p |
| Auburn, Me. | H. W. Rowe 20 A | G. E. Bancroft 6 A | F. W. Ford, Jr. 9 C | H. J. Cook 12 B | W. Atkins 5 A p |
| Auburn, N. Y. | Chester J. Bills 6 A | Fred J. Washburn 34 A | Joseph J. Tehan 10 A† | Arthur J. Adams 12 A | Charles B. Hutchings 19 A p |
| Augusta, Ga. | G. E. W. Britt | John B. Kennedy | E. E. Pund | R. M. Morris | J. M. Lee, Sr. p |
| Augusta, Me. | John J. O'Connell 2 M | George R. McCurdy 8 M | Matthew Broderick 6 M† | Sidney Anthony 12 B | Samuel McCall rs |
| Aurora, Ill. | A. G. Wirz 10 C | L. E. Gramley 4 C | W. E. Barclay 14 E | W. E. Barclay 25 C | Ray Moses 10 C p |
| Austin, Minn. | P. V. Enockson 3 M | N. P. Jensen M | Martin Hanson† | C. L. Elliott 4 B | C. W. Parsons 1 M r |
| Austin, Tex. | R. D. Thorp 7 A | J. E. Woody 7 A | J. E. Motheral† | Albert R. Davis 13 A | J. E. Motheral p |
| Bakersfield, Calif. | Robert B. Powers 1 A | W. E. VanMeter 16 A | J. Holfelder 6 A† | S. E. Dillon | J. Holfelder 6 A p |
| Baltimore, Md. | Charles D. Gaither 6‡ | Howard Travers B | Bernard L. Crozier 4 M | Leon Small 4 M | G. L. Nichols B p |
| Bangor, Me. | Thomas I. Crowley 4 A | William S. Mason 30 A | P. H. Glover | Albert W. Read 5 B | |
| Barberton, Ohio | F. E. Werntz 11 M | Claud Witwer 11 M | H. D. Bushey 1 M | H. D. Claggette 5 M | |
| Barre, Vt. | Dennis Donahue 4 M | John C. Heney 12 M | Thurman W. Dix 10 M | Thurman W. Dix 10 M | Maurice C. Watkins 9 M p |
| Bartlesville, Okla. | L. W. Turner 10 A | A. C. Waite 1 A | J. E. McCormick† | C. E. Perkins 7 | W. M. Trautman 19 A p |
| Batavia, N. Y. | G. Forrest Brown 2 C | Harry V. Gerling 6 C | Roy S. Henderson 6 C | Sherman D. Hall 16 C | Roy S. Henderson 6 C p |
| Baton Rouge, La. | K. H. Strenzke 21 M | R. A. Bogan 17 M | Powers Higginbotham 4 E | H. P. Connell | Powers Higginbotham 4 E p |
| Battle Creek, Mich. | Hugh Gordon 25 C | W. P. Weeks 40 C | J. W. McAuliffe 2 E | W. W. Bridgon 49 C | E. R. Rice 1 E p |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bay City, Mich. | Frank Anderson 2 A | H. C. Crumb 2 A | George L. Lusk | John Crampton 10 A | Ed. Wilhelm* A p |
| Bayonne, N. J. | Cornelius O'Neill C | James G. Hogan 2 C | James J. Donovan 4 E | James J. Bannon | Bert Daly 4 E p |
| Beacon, N. Y. | Jesse B. Dingee‡ | Richard Burger 2 M | Robert Post 1 E | Robert Post 1 E | W. H. Hamm rs |
| Beatrice, Nebr. | Paul Acton 11 C | Cecil Hess 4 C | W. P. McClanahan 1 C | W. P. McClanahan 1 E | E. T. Weeks 7 C p |
| Beaumont, Tex. | L. B. Maddox 1 A | S. D. O'Conor 25 A | George W. McElyea† | Emmett Merritt 20 A | F. L. Bertschler 10 A p |
| Beaver Falls, Pa. | William Davidson 1 C | Richard Timmins 5 C | H. B. McCray† | H. B. Chandley | Joseph W. Littell 3 E p |
| Bedford, Ind. | A. M. Rainbolt 5 M | James Cornwall 25 M | Martin Ridge† | Paul Jackson 5 M | Leon Newland 5 M p |
| Bellaire, Ohio | Francis Moran 8 M | Charles Gratz 15 M | Ed. Conaway 1 M | E. J. Lewis 25‡ | William Powell 15‡ p |
| Belleville, Ill. | Hy. O. Bilzing 4 M | W. A. Finklein M | Fred C. Bonhardt† | | |
| Belleville, N. J. | M. J. Flynn 26‡ | William Hirdes 24‡ | P. A. Water 6 E | | Edward Lister 1‡ r |
| Bellevue, Pa. | William Darling 1 C | J. E. Will A | James Greenough, Jr. C† | Harry Barton | |
| Bellingham, Wash. | William I. Stone * M | Ira Jones 1 M | Bruce Pym† | Arthur Edson* M | John Gibson 31 B pr |
| Belmont, Mass. | John J. O'Brien 6 C | William H. Hill 12 C | William Tompson 9 C | Edward J. Looney 25 B | Lewis F. Harris 11 B r |
| Beloit, Wis. | D. G. Torrisi 2 A | Elmer Fairbert 4 A | C. J. Popelka 4 A | J. J. Gray | Owen Baker 20 A p |
| Benton Harbor, Mich. | Charles Kocher 4 A | Irving Clauser 25 A | C. R. Wightman 2 A | C. R. Wightman 2 A | C. R. Wightman 2 A p |
| Berkeley, Calif. | John A. Greening 2 A | George Haggerty 7 A | Harry Goodridge 5 A† | John S. Longwell | Charles Davis 5 A r |
| Berlin, N. H. | Walter J. Hynes 2 B | H. J. Monahan 10 M | F. L. Brannen 10 M | Wallace Graves 10 B | |
| Berwick, Pa. | Harry Peterson* C | Robert Wolf*‡ | Charles M. Hidlay† | C. E. Burlingame | |
| Berwyn, Ill. | John Regan 2 M | James Hrach 2 M | Anton Fink* M | Anton Fink* M | Frank Baumel 2 M r |
| Bessemer, Ala. | C. Ross‡ | L. B. Hill‡ | R. S. Moon† | S. A. Mills | |
| Bethlehem, Pa. | F. T. Trafford 5 M | A. E. Anderson 17 C | Ario Wear 5 E | William H. Reichard 17 C | Ario Wear 5 E p |
| Beverly, Mass. | Frank Hammond* M | John Cressy 3 M | James W. Blackmer 38 M | James W. Blackmer 38 M | James W. Blackmer 38 p |
| Beverly Hills, Calif. | Charles C. Blair 18 C | Lloyd Canfield 9 C | William R. Metz† | Clyde Kimball 11 C | George Chapman 8 C p |
| Biddeford, Me. | Oscar Parent B | Eugene T. Ricker M | Rodolphe Vanasse M† | Edwin T. McDowell | J. H. Stone M p |
| Big Spring, Tex. | J. T. Thornton 3 A | Olie Cordill 5 A | E. V. Spence 3 C | E. V. Spence 3 C | E. V. Spence 3 C p |
| Billings, Mont. | V. A. Lechner 4 C | V. H. Steele | A. B. Todd | A. L. Hewett 4 B | L. L. Worthington 1 B pr |
| Biloxi, Miss. | Alonzo Gabrich M | Charles Sentell M | John A. Swanzy E | Tom Espisito‡ | John A. Swanzy E p |
| Binghamton, N. Y. | Lacey C. Abel 8 A | E. E. Brown 8 A | John J. Giles 2 A | John J. Giles 2 A | F. J. Pierson 1 A pr |
| Birmingham, Ala. | E. L. Hollums 1 C | B. O. Hargrove 1 C | G. R. Byrum, Jr.† | H. B. Richards | R. S. Marshall 10 B p |
| Bismarck, N. D. | W. R. Ebeling* C | H. A. Thompson 6 C | D. R. MacDonald† | George Doorley 12 | M. H. Atkinson 7 B p |
| Bloomfield, N. J. | Charles F. Jensen 1 C | George E. Koeber 16 C | J. W. Obreiter 3 C† | J. W. Obreiter | C. A. Emmons, Jr. r |
| Bloomington, Ill. | Paul F. Giermann 16 M | R. B. Neal 11 M | Thomas J. Clark† | Chester C. Williams 20 M | Charles E. Hill 8 Mp |
| Bloomington, Ind. | Robert E. Eller‡ | Burton M. Hazel‡ | John T. Stapleton‡ | Fred C. Dillman | Melvin Currie p |
| Bluefield, W. Va. | C. N. Wilson 2 A | E. L. McClure 1 A | | A. L. Rhoads | |
| Blue Island, Ill. | William Hankey 4 M | John Link 25 M | R. B. Hammond 4 M | R. B. Hammond 30 M | A. Strutzenberg 10 Bp |
| Blytheville, Ark. | Ed. Rice‡ | Roy Head‡ | Joe Carney† | Joseph A. Schindler | |
| Bogalusa, La. | T. A. Magee 19 C | E. G. Smith* C | J. H. Slaughter 12 E | H. E. Willis 17 C | |
| Boise, Idaho | Thomas N. Cribbins | W. A. Foster | Melvin Stevens | T. B. Jackson | J. T. McLeod‡ p |
| Boone, Iowa | James B. Reid 16 M | William A. West 27 M | George A. Nelson 10 C† | George A. Nelson 10 C | (Board of 3) E p |
| Boston, Mass. | Martin H. King 2‡ | Henry A. Fox 5‡ | Christopher J. Carven 1 M | Daniel M. Sullivan | William P. Long 8 M p |
| Boulder, Colo. | R. C. Prater 6 A | Emil Johnson 17 A | Charles Gustafson† | (Vacant) | John Mills 7 A p |
| Bowling Green, Ky. | George B. Donnelly 2 M | John Moltenberry 20 M | J. W. Davis† | A. S. Hines | |
| Braddock, Pa. | R. J. Butler 1 C | T. K. Martin 14 C | G. Milton Dillon 1 C | G. Milton Dillon 1 C | |
| Bradford, Pa. | R. Florentine 3 C | E. B. Larkin 22 C | | C. M. Stewart 6 C | J. L. McCutcheon 11 C pr |
| Brainerd, Minn. | Thomas Templeton 9‡ | Frank W. Fuller 6 | | Henry Roberts B | A. C. Falconer 3 M p |
| Braintree, Mass. | John J. Heaney 8 C | Fred A. Tenney 14 C | Fred Austerberry† | John W. Mulcahy 18 B | (Board of 3) 5 E p |
| Brawley, Calif. | J. L. Cromer 8 C | H. L. Stewart 2 C | J. S. Potter† | O. F. Weissgerber* C | Grant Leach 2 A p |

## Table VIII-C.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Police Chief | Fire Chief | Director of Public Works | Water Works Superintendent | Parks and Recreation Director |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bremerton, Wash. | J. W. Tribble 10 M | S. B. Lent 14 M | C. C. Casad 12 M | O. Jarstad 10‡ | O. H. Nystrom 1 M p |
| Bridgeport, Conn. | Charles A. Wheeler 7 B | Thomas F. Burns 6 C | Peter Brewster 2 M | D. H. Hall | Henry Cliffe 21 B p |
| Bridgeton, N. J. | George T. Hamlyn 25 C | Louis G. Heller‡ | J. Boyd Westcott 5 C | J. Boyd Westcott 5 C | Albert E. Hess 3 B p |
| Bristol, Conn. | Ernest T. Belden 29 M | Morgan G. Farrell 1 M | Daniel J. Donovan 2 M | G. Earl Lourie 15 B | William J. Tracy 6 B p |
| Bristol, Pa. | Linford J. Jones 6 C | James L. McGee 5 C | John S. Roberts, Jr. 20† | Livingston Joyce | |
| Bristol, R. I. | R. J. Kavanaugh | Robert Anderson 5 C | Wm. P. McLaughlin† | C. C. Getchell | |
| Bristol, Tenn. | R. L. Morton 8 | W. R. Collin 29 | Arthur Green 3 C† | Arthur Green 3 C | Fred V. Vance 6 E p |
| Brockton, Mass. | James F. Morey | Frank F. Dickinson | Arthur J. Creeden† | Horace Kingman | Arthur E. Staff rs |
| Brookfield, Ill. | Thomas Mahoney 1 M | F. B. McDowell 20 M | Phil Brode† | John Krause 11 M | |
| Brookline, Mass. | H. Allen Rutherford 15 C | Selden R. Allen 11‡ | Daniel G. Lacy 10 C† | Fayette F. Forbes 61 B | Edward P. Sheehan 19 B p |
| Brownsville, Tex. | J. T. Armstrong 5 A | T. P. Sarran 5 A | George M. Hillyer† | W. A. Redding 3 C | |
| Brownwood, Tex. | Bert Hise 4 E | Rance Petty 8‡ | Sam Thomas† | C. N. Davis 35‡ | |
| Brunswick, Ga. | J. E. Register 10 A | J. H. Harrison 20 A | W. H. Slaughter† | Paul Killian | |
| Bucyrus, Ohio | Philip Trautman‡ | William F. Mader‡ | Richard Hertzer 1 M | Ray Riley 8‡ | |
| Buffalo, N. Y. | James W. Higgins 1 M | William R. Castimore 2 M | George J. Summers 1 M | Alan D. Drake 1‡ | Frank A. Coon 1 M p |
| Burbank, Calif. | E. H. Adams‡ | Homer Davis‡ | H. I. Stites‡† | J. H. McCambridge‡ | Dewey Krucksberg‡ p |
| Burlingame, Calif. | John J. Harper 11 C | Wilkie Dessin 13 C | | Harry Schuck 8 C | Frank Anderson C p |
| Burlington, Iowa | Fred J. Machholz 1 C | Frank J. Ostertag 6 C | Charles F. Rolf† | Frank J. Lawler | E. A. Niehaus 3 E p |
| Burlington, N. J. | Frank Gilbert 1‡ | Raymond Cliver 1‡ | Charles Lucas, Sr.† | Nathanile G. Johnson | Alfred Rundle rs |
| Burlington, Vt. | Patrick J. Cosgrove 4 M | Carl D. Stockwell 18 B | George C. Stanley 8 B† | Joseph E. Moore 8 B | George P. Burns 12 B p |
| Butler, Pa. | G. Kelly | I. S. Zorb | C. W. Dumbaugh† | Ira W. Hutchinson | John E. Mixer rs |
| Butte, Mont. | J. J. Murphy‡ | Fred Martin‡ | Mike Laughran 4 M | M. W. Plummer | Mike Laughran 4 Mpr |
| Cairo, Ill. | Leslie Chrestman* C | Peter Lind 22 C | Michael Egan† | C. M. Ross | C. R. Dunlap 10 C p |
| Calumet City, Ill. | J. T. Shupryt 10 M | M. Jaranowski 10 M | Joseph E. Okraj† | Joseph E. Okraj 2 | Edward Fedosky p |
| Cambridge, Mass. | Timothy Leahy* | Herman E. Gutheim 1 M | Wm. R. Meniman 9† | Timothy Good B | Stephen Mahoney 2 B p r |
| Cambridge, Ohio | J. J. Gibson 12‡ | C. C. Long 30‡ | Walter Turner† | Walter Turner 5‡ | |
| Camden, N. J. | Arthur Colsey 1 M | J. Lennox 2 M | Martha Kemble 1 C | James H. Long 20 C | C. M. Harris 4 C p |
| Campbell, Ohio | Frank Cunningham 15 M | James Gustinella 5 M | Joseph Moore 1 M | Joseph Moore 1 M | Joseph Moore 1 M pr |
| Canonsburg, Pa. | Harold Addis | W. H. Arnold | Elmer Kerr† | W. L. Dunn, Jr. | |
| Canton, Ill. | Robert Cook | George Ruey | Rella Johnson† | Chester Miller | |
| Canton, Ohio | Ira A. Manderbaugh M | R. O. Mesnar M | Frank L. DeCorps 2 M | C. B. Shaw 2 M | Carl O. Weiss 2 B p |
| Cape Girardeau, Mo. | E. W. Hirsch 1 M | George French 15‡ | H. L. Coffman† | H. B. Newman | Frank Batchelor 1 E p |
| Carbondale, Pa. | J. F. Murphy 3 C | M. J. Carden 3 C | J. J. O'Neill 3 E† | R. C. Schroeder | G. J. Lesher 2 E p |
| Carlisle, Pa. | Harvey E. Kuhns 1 C | James N. Dysert 5 C | George P. Searight† | George P. Searight 3 C | |
| Carnegie, Pa. | C. H. Keisling, Jr. 10‡ | Orian Baux 20‡ | Robert Bell† | | |
| Carteret, N. J. | Henry J. Harrington 26 M | Denis Fitzgerald 2 E | William Duff† | | |
| Casper, Wyo. | F. G. Scherck 1 M | Oscar Heistand 1 M | J. B. Boyer† | J. B. Boyer 1 M | |
| Cedar Rapids, Iowa | R. S. Tapper 1 | E. P. Kohout 3‡ | F. K. Hahn† | H. F. Bloomquist 15‡ | Edward Stefan 8 E p |
| Central Falls, R. I. | George E. Collette 2 C | Thomas Almond 2 C | Abundius A. Brule 2 C | Abundius A. Brule | Arthur Demers 2 C p |
| Centralia, Ill. | Marion Sligar 4 C | Ed. Archibald 5 C | T. M. King† | W. S. Reichel 1 M | Edgar Drake 4 B r |
| Chambersburg, Pa. | H. S. Byers C | Fred Phillipy‡ | W. H. Washinger† | Robert Monn‡ | Norman Rines r |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Champaign, Ill. | Roy Argo B | John Ely B | W. D. Swearingen | Frank C. Amsbury, Jr. | O. A. Ferguson B p |
| Chanute, Kans. | J. E. Lindquist 12 C | S. R. Stacy 9 C | G. S. Jeffers 6 E | E. M. Flannery 25 C | |
| Charleroi, Pa. | Alex Murray 2 C | H. J. Towstuter C | Jacob Hormell† | William W. Darby | |
| Charleston, S. C. | C. H. Ortmann 10‡ | J. H. Wohlers 3‡ | J. H. Dingle 39 C† | J. E. Gibson 18 B | W. M. Ball 9 B p |
| Charleston, W. Va. | John Britton M | J. L. McLane M | W. L. Medley† | Henry M. Cogan | Thomas E. Garner rs |
| Charlotte, N. C. | E. D. Pittman 4 C | W. H. Palmer 8 C | R. A. Robinson† | W. E. Vest 25 C | (Vacant) |
| Charlottesville, Va. | M. L. Greaver 15 C | C. H. Page 2‡ | L. M. Humphreys† | C. H. Swing 10 A | R. E. Hall 1 A p |
| Chattanooga, Tenn. | C. R. Bryan 6 | Bob Jones 8 | | A. F. Porzelius | B. M. Weaver pr |
| Chelsea, Mass. | Charles M. Finn 13 M | David M. Hudson 25 M | James A. O'Brien 25 M | Hugh J. McLaughlin 2 E | Arthur J. Carolan 12 B p |
| Chester, Pa. | James Davenport 2 M | Alex. Calhoun 3 C | George J. Hunter 9 E† | E. F. Muser | Walter H. Craig 9 E p |
| Cheyenne, Wyo. | T. Joe Cahill 1 C | Ed. P. Taylor 9 C | Paul Hanson† | Z. E. Sevison* C | Jacob Paulus 9 C p |
| Chicago, Ill. | James P. Allman 4 M | Michael J. Corrigan 1 | O. E. Hewitt 4 M | H. L. Meites 4‡ | Walter Wright 7‡ p |
| Chicago Heights, Ill. | J. R. Costabile 1 C | J. C. McCready 3 C | D. P. Bergin 8 E | F. W. DeBolt 12 C | R. I. Davis* B p |
| Chickasha, Okla. | J. C. Hunter 2 E | Frank Dews 1 M | Frank Routh† | B. B. McBurnett M | C. A. Griffin 1 M p |
| Chicopee, Mass. | Frank Callahan‡ | Andrew Sears M | Edward Bourbeau‡ | Elias P. Mossey B | Ike Alpert M r |
| Chillicothe, Ohio | Neil Walker 1 M | William Collins M | Charles Crow† | George E. Hurff | James Hutt 1 B p |
| Cicero, Ill. | Michael Solar 2 | John W. Raleigh 3 | Walter F. Gallas 3 | Frank Broz | Edward J. Pacl p |
| Cincinnati, Ohio | E. T. Weatherly* A | Barney Houston 19 A | J. E. Root 4 A | A. S. Hibbs 5 A | C. H. Meeds 25 B p |
| Clairton, Pa. | H. E. Fulmer 1 C | Francis Tepe 5 | John W. Miller 1 E† | H. N. Schofield | Max Hirshberg 1 E p |
| Claremont, N. H. | Walter J. Hynes | H. J. Monahan | Leonard Gould† | Charles Easter | |
| Clarksburg, W. Va. | R. L. Fetty 2 A | S. R. Hoffman 20 A | P. A. Wadsworth† | S. G. Highland 25 B | J. M. Reynolds 2 A r |
| Clarksdale, Miss. | T. B. Birdsong, Jr. | R. W. Maxwell | W. S. Bobo† | W. W. Pointer | Virginia Curtis rs |
| Cleburne, Tex. | J. W. Miles 2 E | A. B. Russell 6 M | S. A. Ballew† | T. L. Lain 4 B | |
| Cleveland, Ohio | G. J. Matowitz 4 M | James E. Granger 4 M | William F. Eirick | L. A. Quayle 23 M | August J. Kurdziel 2 M p |
| Cleveland Hghts., Ohio | William G. Barrows 13 A | Otto F. Romann 23 A | H. H. Canfield 13 | Otto F. Romann 26 A | H. H. Canfield 13 p |
| Cliffside Park, N. J. | Joseph Borrell | (Vacant) | J. W. McCurry† | Nicholas S. Hill, Jr. | Rose Delossa rs |
| Clifton, N. J. | James N. Marsh* A | John Zanet 4 C | John L. Fitzgerald | George L. Marsh 3 C | |
| Clinton, Iowa | Martin Duffy | Albert Krenz | Martin Hardersen† | W. L. Meeker | |
| Clinton, Mass. | Edward F. McGuire | William E. Powers | Thomas H. Casey | Thomas H. Casey | |
| Coatesville, Pa. | Ralph W. McNeil 3 C | Elmer C. Speakman | | William C. Emigh 3 C | Chester Ash 3 C p |
| Coffeyville, Kans. | C. A. Lang 3 M | Sol E. Hanna 3 M | James Tipton† | F. W. Hoover 2‡ | J. D. Byers 2 p |
| Cohoes, N. Y. | John E. Burke 1‡ | John T. Kelly 1‡ | John F. Poinsel 1 M | Edward Cummings 1‡ | William Fleming 1‡ p |
| Collingswood, N. J. | Charles Fluharty 2 C | Cooper Foster 2 C | Arthur E. Armitage 2 E | Charles W. Dare 5‡ | Arthur E. Armitage 2‡ p |
| Colorado Springs, Colo. | Hugh D. Harper 17 A | C. R. Daily 4 A | C. H. Bryson† | B. B. McReynolds 26 A | Bella Glau rs |
| Columbia, Mo. | A. Y. Slate 2 E | T. M. Walden 1 M | Thomas Kennedy† | D. Elrow Crane 1 M | |
| Columbia, Pa. | Paul Thomas | Salem Wall | | Ted H. Cain | |
| Columbia, S. C. | W. H. Rawlinson 7 C | A. McC. Marsh 13 C | R. J. Thompson† | G. H. White C | |
| Columbus, Ga. | H. W. Cornett 1 C | Monte McEachern 4 C | J. M. Graddy 1 A | C. F. Jordan 20 B | Edwina Wood 3 A r |
| Columbus, Miss. | J. A. Morton 23 C | J. L. Beaty 8 C | Louis Shull 1 C† | J. G. Ellis 19 C | |
| Columbus, Ohio | Fred F. Kuntz 4‡ | Edward P. Welch 2‡ | William J. Lucks 2 M | Clarence B. Hoover 13‡ | R. E. Betz 3‡ p |
| Compton, Calif. | Thomas J. Potter 1 A | Ed. Dowd 5 A | L. Aikens† | C. A. Parrish 2 A | K. W. Mason r |
| Concord, N. H. | George A. S. Kimball B | William T. Happny B | Fred W. Lang B | Percy R. Sanders B | Frank Atkinson B p |
| Concord, N. C. | B. F. Widenhouse 6 C | John L. Miller 33 C | Walter L. Furr 6 C | L. A. Fisher 23 B | |
| Connellsville, Pa. | John C. Wall 2 C | William E. DeBolt 1 C | D. A. Lumen 3 E† | C. A. Coughenour | P. H. Beighley 3 E p |
| Connersville, Ind. | P. P. Fettig 4 M | Joseph Rudd 4 M | Charles Thomas† | Harry Eisenhut 4 M | Anthony Locke 4 C p |
| Conshohocken, Pa. | Francis Blake 3 C | Theodore Speaker 3 C | Thomas McCarter† | | Thomas Coyne 3 C p |
| Coraopolis, Pa. | George Colvin 1 C | Carl Hofacker 4‡ | William Erwing 20 C | H. B. Harriger 5 C | John Hazel 1 C pr |

## Table VIII-C.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Police Chief | Fire Chief | Director of Public Works | Water Works Superintendent | Parks and Recreation Director |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corning, N. Y. | A. Eckess 12 B | J. W. McCarthy 26 B | W. O. Drake† | W. O. Drake 23 B | |
| Corpus Christi, Tex. | A. R. Mace 1 C | W. H. Anderson 2 C | I. R. Vannoy† | G. E. Meisenheimer 2 C | Lon Erwin 2 C p |
| Corsicana, Tex. | Will S. Knight M | E. L. Keith M | W. W. McClendon† | W. W. McClendon M | |
| Cortland, N. Y. | Edgar Grinnell 12 M | Franklin Pierce*‡ | A. R. Reilly 1 B | F. L. Titchener 2 B | Helen Lyman rs |
| Coshocton, Ohio | Ray Duling | James Tracewell | L. C. Marple† | Owen Popham | |
| Council Bluffs, Iowa | George L. Bennett 1 M | J. N. Cochran 4 M | D. W. Pickens† | F. B. Jensen 1 B | Otto Wurl rs |
| Covington, Ky. | John H. Putthoff 2 A | F. A. Northcutt 5 A | Ben M. Vastine 4 A | J. T. Kingsley 6 A | Vincent Keller 1 B p |
| Cranston, R. I. | James G. Miller 6 C | Daniel F. Young 14 C | Elton F. Durfee 10 C | | J. R. Lubrano rs |
| Crawfordsville, Ind. | Thomas Rice 4 M | Harrison Young 4 M | Lex B. Clore† | William P. Mitchell | John H. Warbritton 4 M p |
| Cudahy, Wis. | John C. Medrow 14‡ | Julius Seiy 14‡ | Robert Mueller 4‡ | Irving G. McCreedy 18‡ | Robert Mueller 4‡ p |
| Cumberland, Md. | Oscar A. Eyerman 12‡ | Reed C. Hoenicka 20‡ | Charles Heller† | Wilbur D. Sills 3 C | |
| Cumberland, R. I. | James F. Bradley C | John Savage | J. V. Broderick† | John P. McLaughlin 4 C | |
| Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio | Russell Duffy 13 M | M. E. Harrington 14 M | F. R. Ritchie* M | F. R. Ritchie* M | F. R. Ritchie* M p |
| Dallas, Tex. | C. W. Trammell 11 A | R. D. Gambrell 6 A | O. H. Koch 4 A | J. B. Winder 4 A | Foster Jacoby 18 B pr |
| Danbury, Conn. | George J. Schoen 12 C | John H. McNamara 1 C | Frederick S. Olmstead 6 C | Thomas F. McHugh 6 C | Charles T. Musson rs |
| Danvers, Mass. | John T. McDewell C | Joseph Kelly‡ | A. L. Littlefield† | Roger Estey B | Lester Couch B p |
| Danville, Ill. | R. H. Johnson 4 M | Frank Davis 4 M | H. J. Boord 4 E | H. M. Ely | F. F. Bott 4 E p |
| Danville, Va. | J. H. Martin 5 | L. F. Mitchell 14 C | C. L. Scott, Jr. 9 C | H. A. Johnson 5 | E. G. McCain 16 p |
| Davenport, Iowa | Sam Kelly 1 M. | Richard Kelly 7 B | R. C. Graham 1 C | Charles Henderson 24 | C. O. E. Boehme 20 B p |
| Dayton, Ohio | R. E. Wurstner 10 A | W. W. McFadden* A | George F. Baker 12 A | W. W. Morehouse 13 A | William Madden 21 A p |
| Daytona Beach, Fla. | J. B. Haney 1 A | B. B. Hart 16 A | R. L. Jones 1 A | (Vacant) | John Sheedy 1 A r |
| Dearborn, Mich. | Carl A. Brooks 6 M | Roy E. Mottesheard 10 M | Mark B. Owen 7 M | Owen A. McCarty 12 M | H. D. Schubert 4 M r |
| Decatur, Ala. | C. M. Riggsbee 19 C | L. F. Elkins 1 C | J. W. Petty† | W. R. Speer | |
| Decatur, Ga. | George S. Swords‡ | L. N. Morgan C‡ | (Vacant) | C. C. VonGremp‡ | A. F. Newman‡ p |
| Decatur, Ill. | E. F. Wills 8 M | William Platt 3‡ | A. L. McNabb† | W. S. Eisele 3‡ | J. A. Frazier 7 B p |
| Dedham, Mass. | John F. Cahill C | H. J. Harrigan C | D. H. Livingstone C | Wilfred L. Newman | |
| Del Rio, Tex. | Amos Humphreys* C | Harry Arfman 4 C | Otto A. Koog 1 C | August Herzing 36 C | Frank J. Schmidt 8 Cp |
| Denison, Tex. | J. R. Dishner 6 M | O. L. Garvin 4 M | A. M. Brenneke† | A. M. Brenneke 6 M | |
| Denver, Colo. | George Marland*‡ | John F. Healy 23‡ | Allen S. Fogg 4 M | E. G. Plowman 1 B | W. B. Lowry 4 M p |
| Derby, Conn. | Thomas VanEtten 7 B | Harold Carey B | Robert Clerke M† | | |
| Des Moines, Iowa | H. A. Alber | William Burnett‡ | George King† | Dale Maffitt | Iowa Welsh 3 E p |
| Detroit, Mich. | H. A. Pickert 2 M | Walter F. Israel 4 B | L. G. Lenhardt 4 M | George Fenkell 12 B | Henry Busch 10 M p |
| Dickson City, Pa. | William Creavey | William Grifthis | Walter Kolczinski† | | |
| Dodge City, Kans. | Joe Sughrue 2 C | A. S. Warren 20 C | Alex Mullendore† | Rex Reynolds 19 C | W. S. Ford 8 C p |
| Donora, Pa. | William Smedley 15 C | Charles Cumberland 10 C | L. G. Sphar† | | |
| Dormont, Pa. | R. B. Miller 6 C | Edward C. Custer 2‡ | Harold L. Cloud 5 C | | Ronald Faas 3 C p |
| Dothan, Ala. | M. Tatum 4 C | J. E. Zeigler 10 C | J. A. McKinnon† | R. J. Goodwin 12 C | |
| Dover, N. H. | Andrew H. McDaniel 2 B | T. W. O'Neil* C | Ernest L. Lucas 6 E† | Walter C. Campbell 9 B | Dorothy Greenaway 1 B r |
| Dover, N. J. | James T. Hart 15 C | Floyd S. Hann* C | Charles A. Nelson | William M. Hedden 12 B | Robert VanOrden rs |
| DuBois, Pa. | R. R. Love 10 C | Louis Chambers 1‡ | E. W. Fair 1 C | C. P. Jacox 3 E | C. P. Jacox 3 E p |
| Dubuque, Iowa | John Giellis 21 A | William Ryan 5 A | Thomas Byrne 3 A† | J. W. McEvoy 16 A | A. Caldwell 1 B p |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Duluth, Minn. | R. E. Donaldson 4‡ | J. A. Fisher 2‡ | James A. Farrell 2 E | Felix Seligman 1 | F. R. Paine 9‡ p |
| Dunkirk, N. Y. | J. J. Warren 13 B | Donald Staley 1 B | John J. Duncan† | Warren O. Peck B | K. Hoeppner rs |
| Dunmore, Pa. | John J. Burke C | P. J. Murphy C | Walter G. Joyce† | | |
| Duquesne, Pa. | Thomas J. Flynn 18 C | Lawrence Trainor 10 C | J. M. Lenhart 10 E | E. F. Williams 18 C | M. H. Kowallis 3 E p |
| Durham, N. C. | G. W. Proctor 30 C | F. W. Bennett 26 C | H. W. Kueffner 21 C | J. C. Michie 19 C | C. R. Wood 10 C r |
| East Chicago, Ind. | Otto Stumpf* M | Ivon Friend 2 M | (Board of 3) | Bruce Miller 10 B | Ray Stubbs 9 B p |
| East Cleveland, Ohio | L. G. Corlett 12 A | H. A. King 10 A | Harold L. Green 6 A† | M. W. Garnett 10 A | H. L. Green 6 A pr |
| Easthampton, Mass. | James L. Campbell*‡ | John J. Lynn 6 B | M. H. Buzzee 12 E | M. J. Murphy 4 B | |
| East Hartford, Conn. | William J. McKee 15 B | J. F. Meunier 13 B | C. H. Olmsted 4 M | John Landers 6 B | F. J. Busiere 5 B p |
| East Liverpool, Ohio | H. J. McDermott M | C. A. Bryan M | E. B. Laughlin 1 M | William Staats M | W. H. Vodrey, Sr. p |
| East Moline, Ill. | T. J. Schafer 15‡ | P. Godiesbois 15‡ | Charles Vogler† | Arnold Neihaus 2 E | E. Soule 6 M p |
| Easton, Pa. | F. C. Fredericks 13 M | L. A. Davison 15‡ | Charles Collmar 6 E | W. B. Johnson | William H. Clause 1 C p |
| East Orange, N. J. | C. N. Dell 4 M | Charles A. McGinley 8 M | Wm. D. Willigerod† | Roswell M. Roper 15 B | Frances H. Haire 10 B r |
| East Providence, R. I. | James R. Crosby 4 C | Arthur A. Griswold C | Albert A. Whitaker 10 C† | J. V. Turner | Otho F. Smith rs |
| East St. Louis, Ill. | James Murphy 4 C | James Ames 8 C | Thomas J. Corrigan† | Charles M. Horner | E. P. Griffin 12 B p |
| Eau Claire, Wis. | Chris Laursen 12 B | J. P. Welsh 26 B | Frank Grubert† | Edw. Brown 19 C | A. M. Olson rs |
| Ecorse, Mich. | George Moore C | Albert Yeager C | Worth Davidson C | Worth Davidson C | |
| El Dorado, Ark. | W. W. Cross‡ | F. H. Smith‡ | Henry Clawer† | | |
| El Dorado, Kans. | Charles Parton 2‡ | Donald J. Rayburn 12 | F. E. Schide 4 | George Hayman 25‡ | E. E. Smith 8‡ p |
| Elgin, Ill. | Joseph Huber 4 C | Robert Whalen 4 C | Water McLean 4 E | William Trentlage 4 E | Milton A. Grow 4 E p |
| Elizabeth, N. J. | M. J. Mulcahy | William H. Kenah | Wm. P. Neafsey† | Welcome W. Bender | C. A. Allen r |
| Elizabeth City, N. C. | R. C. Madrin 1 B | J. B. Flora‡ | L. W. Anderson† | J. C. Parker 10 | |
| Elkhart, Ind. | Elmer Manning* M | Alex Dotson* M | Clyde E. Paxson | W. Swartz*‡ | J. N. Meyers* M p |
| Ellwood City, Pa. | W. C. Morrison 14 C | H. T. Plante 8 C | Robert E. Linn† | P. R. Lutton | |
| Elmhurst, Ill. | George Kummerow 2‡ | Gus Weber 10‡ | A. C. Warren 2 M | A. C. Warren 2 M | O. V. Morgan 4 B p |
| Elmira, N. Y. | Elvin D. Weaver 20 A | John H. Espey 30 A | Florence J. Sullivan 1 C† | Harry M. Beardsley 20 B | Frank H. Wright 1 A p |
| Elmwood Park, Ill. | Frank Rice 7 C | Hank Sells C | Edward Peters† | Elmer Beck* C | Kennith Weiler* C r |
| El Paso, Tex. | L. T. Robey 7 M | John T. Sullivan 8 M | J. C. Galbraith 4 E | A. L. Hawley 2 M | Hugo C. Meyer 12 M p |
| Elwood, Ind | Elmer Tunis* M | James Merritt* M | | Charles Barnes | Sam Rummel* M p |
| Elyria, Ohio | E. J. Stankard 25 M | W. N. Bates 29 M | Fred Underhill 4 M | Fred Underhill 4 M | Frank Wilford 12 M p |
| Emporia, Kans. | R. L. Clay M | Charles Stinson 30 M | A. J. Ericsson 1 E | M. Dunsworth‡ | |
| Endicott, N. Y. | Daniel Frutiger 21 C | Charles Huber 15 B | C. F. Hunt 15 C | Earl J. Grippen | |
| Englewood, N. J. | Chas. A. Peterson 4 M | William J. Ford 9 C | Joseph B. Daily 14 C | N. S. Hill, Jr. | Alex McCloy p |
| Enid, Okla. | John Burns 2 | J. D. Weissinger 10 | C. C. Lemon† | Cecil Harrison | |
| Erie, Pa. | George J. Christolph 1 C | M. J. Leonard 7 C | Stanley A. Dessert† | J. S. Dunwoody | Edward J. Allen r |
| Escanaba, Mich. | J. J. Tolan 19 A | Arvid Johnson 17 A | A. V. Aronson 12 A | Charles Toushak 18 A | T. F. Kessler 9 C p |
| Euclid, Ohio | Charles Fox 2 M | Ernest Earick 8‡ | John L. Sullivan 10 M | William J. Rogers | John L. Sullivan 10 M p |
| Eugene, Ore. | C. F. Bergman 3 M | W. E. Nusbaum 20 M | C. A. LeVan† | Walter Moore 2 B | Charles Sullivan 2 M p |
| Eureka, Calif. | George A. Littlefield 6 M | Eugene Berry 1 E | John Griffith 20 | John Griffith | G. A. Sarvis 2 M p |
| Evanston, Ill. | W. H. Freeman 9 M | A. N. Hofstetter 21 M | A. W. Handford 10 M | W. W. Polk M | C. T. Byrnes M r |
| Evansville, Ind. | Ira Wiltshire 9 M | Alex Houghland 1 M | Louis A. Geupel 1 M | Charles Streithot 9 M | Max Ritter 5 M p |
| Everett, Mass. | George O. Kenney 2 | James A. Evans 5 | John Gianantonio* | Brenton W. Vaughan | John DiVenuti rs |
| Everett, Wash. | George English 3‡ | C. E. Swanson 7‡ | Charles J. Ericson 3 E | G. G. Paine 1‡ | Oden Hall B p |
| Fairfield, Ala. | Y. L. Anthony 15 C | Y. L. Anthony 2 C | E. J. Bird† | | J. T. Williamson 2 C p |
| Fairhaven, Mass. | George T. Sykes 3‡ | Edward G. Spooner 15‡ | H. T. Howard† | Henry T. Gidley | Mabel F. Potter p |
| Fairmont, W. Va. | William B. Moran 8 B | R. F. Doolittle 18 B | G. H. Shomaker† | J. Clyde Morris 16 E | |

## Table VIII-C.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Police Chief | Fire Chief | Director of Public Works | Water Works Superintendent | Parks and Recreation Director |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fall River, Mass. | Abel J. Violette B | J. F. Sullivan B | Thomas J. Logan M | John W. Moran B | Howard Lothrop B p |
| Fargo, N. D. | C. W. Albright 8 C | J. W. Sutherland 37 C | Alex Duncan† | O. C. Ayliffe 20 C | |
| Faribault, Minn. | Albert Hanson 6 C | M. S. Morgan 6 C | Charles MacKenzie† | I. E. Wilson 20 C | |
| Farrell, Pa. | Carl McCartney 3 C | J. C. Davis 3 C | John Krauss 3 E | | |
| Fayetteville, N. C. | J. Ross Jones C | S. W. Tillinghast C | F. Hall† | J. L. Weathers | |
| Ferndale, Mich. | C. J. Barnett 2 C | Donald D. Post 4 C | Charles Kneshtel 15 A | J. C. Winnie 3 A | R. L. Peel rs |
| Findlay, Ohio | Leo M. Larkins 4 M | Ray Long 6‡ | S. E. Frost 4 M | O. C. Gohlke 9‡ | S. E. Frost 4 M p |
| Fitchburg, Mass. | Thomas J. Godley 14 M | Michael J. Shea 2 M | Joseph M. Peirce 6 M | Arthur Brown 52 M | Charles Sweeny 1 B p |
| Flint, Mich. | James V. Wills 3 A | Edward H. Price 41 A | James R. Pollock 3 A | Earl L. Holloway 7 A | George H. McKinley 17 Bp |
| Floral Park, N. Y. | James Humphrey 6 C | Arthur J. Ennis 1 B | Edward P. Campbell 1 C | | Louis P. Weber 3 M p r |
| Florence, Ala. | W. L. Stutts | Donald White | T. G. Martin† | H. W. Goher | |
| Florence, S. C. | E. R. McIver 13 C | J. E. McKain 20 C | | David G. Adams | |
| Fond du Lac, Wis. | James Silgen, Sr. 13 B | George Smithers 3 B | Al. Huelsman† | Edward J. Braun 8 B | Frank Russell 6 B p |
| Forest Park, Ill. | Fred W. Licht 15 C | John Pries 18 C | Eugene Reda† | William Coudoux 4 C | |
| Fort Collins, Colo. | Fred Blumenthal | Thomas P. Treadwell 5 C | D. C. Armitage 3 E | D. C. Armitage 3 E | |
| Fort Dodge, Iowa | J. P. Lochray 2 C | H. J. Callahan 10 C | F. R. Campbell† | J. W. Pray 30 C | A. J. Steinhoff C p |
| Fort Madison, Iowa | L. E. Peckham 6 M | R. S. Willard 10 M | C. R. Hart† | L. J. Kearns | |
| Fort Scott, Kans. | Robert L. Wells 2 C | Charles H. Durossette 3 C | F. D. Martin 2 E† | Freeman D. Martin | Edward Ball 2 C p |
| Fort Smith, Ark. | Hugh Conner 4 M | M. J. Brun 22‡ | J. K. Jordan 2 E | W. H. Vaughn 8 E | W. H. Vaughn 8 E pr |
| Fort Thomas, Ky. | Louis W. Cook, Jr. 20 C | B. J. Nielander 7 C | | | |
| Fort Wayne, Ind. | George F. Eisenhut* B | John C. Stahlhut B | Robert G. Beams* M | Jack O'Connor B | A. Jaenicke B p |
| Fort Worth, Tex. | Henry Lewis 2 A | O. S. Ferguson 14 A | D. C. Lipscomb† | L. A. Quigley 10 A | Harry Adams 5 B p |
| Fostoria, Ohio | John Walsh 1 M | E. A. Doe 4 M | Charles A. Latshaw 3 M | William Lord, Sr. 35 M | (Board of 3) M p |
| Framingham, Mass. | William W. Holbrook C | Leroy Trevett C | Bernard F. Merriam E | James Hancock | N. I. Bowditch E p |
| Frankfort, Ind. | Harry L. Moore | J. A. Stinson M | G. C. Garrott† | S. E. Stern | Harry Burkhalter M p |
| Frankfort, Ky. | Crawford Lee 1 M | George Conway 1 C | Lee Shelton† | J. Q. Kline | |
| Franklin, Pa. | F. M. Sheffer 10 C | C. R. Reib 5 C | King Gilliland 5 E | P. B. Hied 25 C | |
| Frederick, Md. | Allen Bartgis 1 M | | John T. Best† | Frank Eppley 1 M | (Board of 3) M p |
| Freeport, Ill. | A. H. Wilkey 27 M | Al Luedeke 20 M | Clyde E. Rhodes 6‡ | | Norman C. Sleezer rs |
| Freeport, N. Y. | John N. Hartmann 12 B | Irving Whaley 1 B | Ernest Dreschert | Alan C. Southard 4 B | |
| Fremont, Nebr. | James E. Sylvis 6 M | Theo. Schmidt 4 | J. Rex Henry B | L. D. Wright | A. E. Anderson M p |
| Fremont, Ohio | Henry Klopfer 20 M | William Berger 15 M | C. A. Hochenedel 1 M | C. J. Harris 15 M | Albert Fiegelist 15 M p |
| Fresno, Calif. | Frank Truax 26‡ | W. R. Williams 7‡ | Jean L. Vincenz 6 E | Claude H. Weekes 3 C | Raymond Quigley 21‡ p |
| Fullerton, Calif. | J. M. Pearson 6 | R. R. Davis 12‡ | H. A. Hiltschert† | Grover L. Walters | H. E. Byerrum 8 p |
| Fulton, N. Y. | E. J. Dyer 12 B | H. L. Waugh 20 B | H. S. Andrews 8 M | H. S. Andrews 8 M | H. S. Andrews 8 M p |
| Gadsden, Ala. | S. L. O'Bannon 4 C | S. T. Green 4 C | J. H. Meighan 4 | Sam Silvey 4 C | Mrs. Tyler Watts rs |
| Gainesville, Fla. | Charles Pinkoson 1 A | E. F. Beville 14 A | W. A. Ford† | H. J. Pitman 4 A | L. R. Bullard 10 A p |
| Galesburg, Ill. | A. B. Goff 4‡ | Earl Cratty 4‡ | O. F. Larson† | H. O. Chambers 4‡ | D. C. Bunker 8‡ p |
| Galveston, Tex. | Tony Messina C | A. H. Bockelman C | Robert Colley† | E. J. Elliott C | R. J. Colley C p |
| Gardner, Mass. | Cyrille Leblanc 7 M | Robert M. Tappin 8 M | Nelson Beaudett 1 M | W. J. Wetherbee 12 B | Charles R. Shaw 4 B p |
| Garfield, N. J. | N. Perrapato 8 M | Peter Bondonna 1 M | Ernest Dahnert 1 M | James McAlpine M | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gary, Ind. | Lawrence Studness* M | Thomas Clune* M | R. Howard Atcheson | George N. Rooker | William Degan 10 B p |
| Gastonia, N. C. | J. C. Elliott 6 A | G. F. McLaughen 13 A | J. C. Wilson† | C. E. Rhyne 16 A | |
| Geneva, N. Y. | R. W. Morris 8 B | Louis McGuigan B | James W. Brennan 9 B | James W. Brennan 9 | Frank Kelleher 12 B p |
| Glen Cove, N. Y. | Frank McCue 8‡ | John Zielazny 3‡ | John L. Lange 1 E | William H. Ogden | John L. Lange 1 E p |
| Glendale, Calif. | John D. Fraser 13 A | A. H. Lankford 14 A | Jack C. Albers 5 A† | Peter Diederich 25 A | Jack C. Albers 1 A p |
| Glens Falls, N. Y. | George Culver 5 B | William Gates 10 B | Neil Havens 1 M | Ernest Meyer 15 B | Ruth Sherburne 10 B r |
| Gloucester, Mass. | Daniel M. Casey 10 C | H. R. Marchant 10 C | Henry Parsons 5 C | John Moran 35 B | Sheldon Sudbay 6 B p |
| Gloucester, N. J. | James Smith 5 M | William Reynolds 5 M | J. Wm. Mullin† | J. Pursglove 10 M | |
| Gloversville, N. Y. | George R. Smith 34‡ | R. A. Maxson 34‡ | Frederick H. Durfee† | William F. Davies 4 B | George R. Robinson 25 C p |
| Goldsboro, N. C. | E. J. Tew 18 A | Max Cohn 4 A | Z. G. Hollowell 8 C | Z. G. Hollowell 8 C | Roy Parker 12 A p |
| Goshen, Ind. | Vernon Cripe* M | Jess Delcamp* M | C. E. Firestone | Merle Miller 5 M | |
| Grand Forks, N. D. | Ed. Hough 1‡ | James Black 8‡ | John Klevent† | R. M. Jenson 1‡ | Mrs. M. B. Kannowski 3 B p |
| Grand Island, Nebr. | Harry L. Moore 2 M | C. C. Campbell 2 M | Charles Wennt† | C. W. Burdick 14 M | H. Schirkofsky M p |
| Grand Junction, Colo. | H. E. Decker 9 A | Charles Downing 3 A | C. R. Sutherland† | Ray Garber 3 A | B. Brownson 12 A p |
| Grand Rapids, Mich. | A. A. Carroll 20 A | George Boughner 19 A | Earl R. Weeber* A | C. H. Grinnell 8‡ | U. M. Lowing 5‡ p |
| Granite City, Ill. | John Tappel 2 M | James Marsh 14 M | John D. Bell† | | R. E. Frohardt rs |
| Great Falls, Mont. | C. L. Sheridan 2 M | Harry Hogan 2 M | H. H. Roadhouse† | Gordon E. Pappin 1 M | T. S. M. Lease 4 B p |
| Greeley, Colo. | Seacil Roberts 6 C | Jess Mason 2 C | W. H. Welsh† | M. Seaman 22 C | W. H. Welsh 4 C p |
| Green Bay, Wis. | Thomas E. Hawley | Ralph Drum | J. B. Bardouche† | James Church B | L. Earl Fogelsang 4 B p |
| Greenfield, Mass. | Thomas Manning 1 C | Herbert R. Ferris 1 C | Eugene L. Bond 1 C | Harold L. Field 1 B | Harry Debruin 1 B p |
| Greensboro, N. C. | M. D. Caffey 5 A | F. D. Shaw 9 A | C. W. Smedberg 4 A | C. W. Smedberg 10 A | C. W. Smedberg 4 A p |
| Greensburg, Pa. | George Westover 8 C | O. F. Myers 8‡ | O. R. Deemer† | M. W. Crownover | F. G. Reamer 2 E p |
| Greenville, Miss. | William Taggart 6 C | E. O. Donovan 25 C | W. B. Ashley† | F. E. Hall 8 | |
| Greenville, S. C. | J. E. Smith 2 C | F. E. Donnald 2 C | Dan A. Hulick† | H. W. Perry 15 B | John A. McPherson 15 C p |
| Greenville, Tex. | Frank Wolfe 2 E | Charles W. Combs 10 C | Ed. B. Williams† | T. S. Mitchell 5 E | Ed. B. Williams 3 E p |
| Greenwood, Miss. | R. L. Miller* C | G. T. Haskins 4 C | F. M. Hobbs | Roy Stott | S. H. Montgomery* E p |
| Greenwood, S. C. | J. A. Cobb | C. D. Beaudrot | A. T. Clegg† | F. W. Chapman | |
| Griffin, Ga. | J. S. Harper 5 A | J. J. Powell 15 A | J. A. Mullins 4 A† | H. P. Powell 13 C | J. A. Mullins 4 A p |
| Grosse Pte. Park, Mich. | James C. Drysdale 7 M | Richard Holme 7 M | Charles H. Marden 14 M | Walter H. Knapp 12 M | William G. Stamman 1 M p |
| Gulfport, Miss. | B. F. Cruthirds 4 M | E. F. Thompson M | George W. O'Dom 27 E | George W. O'Dom 27 E | Ivan Ballenger 2 E p |
| Hackensack, N. J. | William Munz 1 A | F. P. Walsh 1 A | Lee Campbell 2 A | John C. Schlicht | Russell A. Summers rs |
| Hagerstown, Md. | Clarence G. Emmert 2 B | Max Hoover 3‡ | Samuel L. Greenawalt† | Albert Heard 17 B | John Heck 2 B p |
| Hamilton, Ohio | J. C. Calhoun 7 A | William Conlin 6 A | C. N. Teaff 7 A | Joseph Hart 32 A | L. J. Smith 18 A p |
| Hammond, Ind. | Thomas Martinson M | William Nill M | George St. John† | William Williams | Russell Gavit 4 M r |
| Hamtramck, Mich. | Joseph Rustoni 1 M | Ed. Sawtell 1 M | F. L. Pabst M | Walter Pakulski 1 M | C. J. Reid r |
| Hannibal, Mo. | W. J. Schneider 2 E | Elmer Miller* C | W. S. Watson 3 B | W. S. Watson 3 B | Mary Harrison rs |
| Hanover, Pa. | Norman W. Keeney 2 C | Charles E. Donsen* C | C. A. Eckbert 8 C | Roy W. Straley 2 B | C. A. Eckbert 8 C p |
| Harlingen, Tex. | E. W. Anglin 4 M | B. P. Gamble* M | W. W. Sachtleben† | A. P. Payne | J. A. Kendrick 2 B p |
| Harrisburg, Ill. | Harry Moyer 2 C | Harrison Melton 4 C | Bolen Perkins 4 C | Don T. Lacey | Louie E. Beltz rs |
| Harrisburg, Pa. | George J. Shoemaker 4 C | Edward Halbert 1 C | William J. Fickes 1 E | William T. DeHart 1 E | J. Calvin Frank 1 E pr |
| Harrison, N. J. | Peter F. Brady 8 M | Andrew T. Callahan 17 M | Frank J. McEvoy | William A. Camion 33 M | Joseph Pyne 3 B r |
| Hartford, Conn. | Garrett J. Farrell 22 C | John C. Moran 21 C | Leon F. Peck 22 C† | Caleb M. Saville 23 B | George H. Hollister 26 B p |
| Harvey, Ill. | George Swanson 16‡ | C. W. Madsen 6‡ | Gus Piazza† | C. M. Ginter 4‡ | |
| Hastings, Nebr. | J. C. McCleery 2 M | Peter Murphy 5 M | Roscoe C. Burch 2 M† | Cooney Shafer 2 B | A. J. VanEvery 2 M p |
| Hattiesburg, Miss. | John F. Bennett | C. E. Norsworthy | J. H. Bradley† | John L. Arledge | |

## Table VIII-C.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Police Chief | Fire Chief | Director of Public Works | Water Works Superintendent | Parks and Recreation Director |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Haverhill, Mass. | Charles D. Jones 8 C | Rufus A. Crittenden 2 C | John H. Curtin* C† | Herbert C. Crowell 23 B | Frederick J. Caswell 14 B pr |
| Hawthorne, N. J. | Ryan Vanderwalk | Charles Buono | Frank Schoon† | Peter Vanderberg | |
| Hazleton, Pa. | G. W. Brownson 17 C | George Brandau 2 C | John Walters 1 E | Dan J. McGeehin | Michael Fescina 9 E pr |
| Helena, Mont. | Roger G. Smith 3 C | Martin Juhl 18 C | Noble P. Evans† | Oscar A. Baarson | Noble P. Evans 1 E p |
| Hempstead, N. Y. | Phinias A. Seaman 15 C | Austin Ryan 1‡ | John M. Stoddard 5 C | Peter Kelly 16 C | J. Esterbrook 16 C p |
| Henderson, Ky. | Thomas Todd 1 C | J. Tillotson 1 C | George A. Vogel 1 E | Paul Burch 1 C | L. L. Hurley 1 E p |
| Herkimer, N. Y. | Morris J. Keller | Harry Vincent | Paul Greiner† | C. Leland Wood | William Pratt r |
| Hibbing, Minn. | Chester Naeseth | C. E. McIllhargey | Leo Coons C | Harry Brownell C | Hubert Dear C p |
| Highland Park, Ill. | Edward Moroney 18 C | Edward Haskin 12 C | J. H. Taylor 4 E† | George B. Prindle 6 C | E. B. Brown p |
| Highland Park, Mich. | Dan E. L. Patch 5 B | Floyd Baker 3 B | J. H. Moorhouse 2 C | C. F. Schearer 8 C | J. H. Moorhouse 2 C p |
| High Point, N. C. | W. G. Friddle 4 A | E. K. Ingram 2 A | S. H. Strickland 8 A | J. L. Perkins 4 A | W. F. Bailey 2 A p |
| Hoboken, N. J. | Edward McFeely 16 C | John Gilday 21 C | Adolph C. Carstens E | William H. Gilfert | Louis Bender C p |
| Holland, Mich. | Frank Van Ry 18 B | C. Blom, Jr. 40 B | Abe Nauta 4 B | Abe Nauta 4 B | John VanBragt 15 B p |
| Holyoke, Mass. | David F. Allyn 2 M | Patrick J. Hurley 20‡ | (Board of 3) M | Patrick Gear 30 B | Henry J. McNulty 1 B pr |
| Homestead, Pa. | M. J. Maroney 13 C | Herman Samuels 9 C | Chris McGarry 9 C | Chris McGarry 9 C | Henry Williams 20 C p |
| Hopewell, Va. | George G. Anderson 1 C | J. J. Cuddihy 18 C | E. E. Stanley 2 A | G. L. Spratley | W. P. Cleveland 4 A p |
| Hopkinsville, Ky. | Ben S. Winfree 6 C | Joe East 5 C | Charles Vaughn 23 C | Leslie Baxby 1 | H. G. Waldington 1 C p |
| Hoquiam, Wash. | Norman Foote* M | W. A. Crawford 20 M | E. Ohman 3 M | W. L. Lovejoy* M | |
| Hornell, N. Y. | Clarence Bailey 27‡ | Platt M. Bond 12‡ | F. Hurd Robinson† | F. Hurd Robinson 20‡ | F. Hurd Robinson 23‡ p |
| Hot Springs, Ark. | Joe Wakelin 7 M | Loyed Tate 12 M | James Holland 12 M† | Barney Brown | James Holland 12 M p |
| Houston, Tex. | George E. Woods 2‡ | E. B. Hartwell 2‡ | J. M. Nagle 5† | J. P. Daugherty 25‡ | C. L. Brock 22‡ p |
| Hudson, N. Y. | Thomas L. Connors 12‡ | Louis Sacco*‡ | J. M. Wardle 5‡ | J. M. Wardle 5‡ | J. M. Wardle 5‡ p |
| Huntington, Ind. | Ray Forst* M | Marshall Ellett 11 M | George Douglas† | James Adkins* M | William Skinner* M p |
| Huntington, W. Va. | Golden Adkins 5 M | Golden Adkins 5 M | Roy W. Breece† | H. E. Watt | A. R. Hunt 10 B p |
| Huntington Park, Calif. | H. A. Atkinson 1 C | J. H. Douglass 3 C | W. E. Ford† | Vaughn Wood 3 C | W. E. Ford 26 C p |
| Huntsville, Ala. | H. C. Blakemore 8 C | R. M. Milam 15 C | W. S. Berry† | J. S. Wall 9 C | |
| Huron, S. D. | J. S. Nelson 1 B | Max Teuber 4 | E. C. Hoskins† | L. P. Madsen 1 B | Robert Fair 5 B pr |
| Hutchinson, Kans. | B. H. Salyers 2 M | Glen West 2 M | H. J. Haskard 2 E | J. E. Beyer, Jr. | C. F. Carpenter 2 M p |
| Independence, Kans. | T. S. Thompson 1 C | Roy Pitts 18 C | Clarence Skillings† | J. C. Gordon 24 C | E. H. Leuttke 6 M p |
| Independence, Mo. | D. O. Cato 5 E | D. A. Kincade 20 M | W. Campbell M† | H. A. Gallagher | |
| Indianapolis, Ind. | Michael F. Morrissey 3 B | Fred J. Kennedy* B | Hubert S. Riley* M | Howard Scott Morse | A. C. Sallee 5 B p |
| Inglewood, Calif. | H. L. Bennett 4 C | Bacil Roberts 11 C | Arthur W. Cory 6 C† | D. H. Griffith 10 C | W. D. Frantz 5 C p |
| Iowa City, Iowa | W. H. Bender 2 M | Herman Amish 6 M | J. F. Sproat† | George J. Keller | William Fischer 2 B p |
| Irondequoit, N. Y. | Willis C. Crane 8 B | | | Joseph Blum 1 B | |
| Iron Mountain, Mich. | William O. Ferzacca 11 B | Mike Scolatti 12 B | H. L. Senseman† | H. L. Senseman 8 C | |
| Ironton, Ohio | D. J. Callahan 7 A | E. E. George 7 A | Henry Stapf† | Henry Howell 14 A | |
| Ironwood, Mich. | I. A. Chouinard 8 A | Alec Olson 4 A | J. P. Lofberg 5 A | J. E. Sahlin 4 A | J. L. Garland 1 A r |
| Irvington, N. J. | A. Ruban‡ | Harvey Campbell‡ | J. E. Jacobi 4 E | A. E. Andruss | Clarence Biebel 4‡ p |
| Ithaca, N. Y. | William Marshall 31 M | B. J. Reilly 35 B | (Board of 6) 6 B | George Carpenter 5 B | R. S. Baker 8 B p |
| Jackson, Mich. | Edward Harris* A | Ernest Dounter 2 A | L. McAllister 4 A | D. J. Stellingworth 6 A | John Love 2 A p |
| Jackson, Miss. | J. E. Simmons C | L. F. McDonald 18 C | W. P. Kimball† | J. H. Fewell 18 C | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jackson, Tenn. | Andrew Taylor 12 C | B. L. Warlick 17 C | R. E. Franklin 8 E | S. C. Frye 20 C | T. R. Boxley 16 C p |
| Jacksonville, Fla. | A. J. Roberts 13 C | W. Q. Dowling 1 C | R. E. Parrish† | O. Z. Tyler 14 C | W. C. Pons C p |
| Jacksonville, Ill. | Frank Baker M | Carl E. Liter M | Joseph Gomez† | George E. Stoldt M | Terrance Brennan B p |
| Jamestown, N. Y. | Charles A. Sandburg 1 M | Clifton J. Beatty 6 M | Leland L. Graham 1 M | Clayton O. Johnson 1 B | Paul A. Clark 1 C r |
| Janesville, Wis. | Charles Newman 14 A | C. J. Murphy 50 A | James Lustig 10 A | H. A. Griffy 19 A | Kenneth Bick 10 A r |
| Jeannette, Pa. | Charles E. Walter 3 C | Thomas Milburn 10 C | Samuel Adams 3 C | James T. Billups | Attillio Delvitto p |
| Jefferson City, Mo. | John A. Brunner | F. E. Robertson | W. A. Curtis† | L. W. Helmreich | |
| Jeffersonville, Ind. | John Hibstenberg 4 M | John E. Coy 4 M | R. E. Kirk† | | R. E. Kirk 4 M p |
| Jersey City, N. J. | Daniel J. Casey 1 C | Roger Boyle 20 C | Michael I. Fagen 18 E | A. B. Mauzy 13 C | William J. McGovern* C pr |
| Johnson City, N. Y. | Joseph C. Huff 9 M | J. R. Eldridge 18 M | James C. Adams† | Arthur C. Merrill 12 B | |
| Johnson City, Tenn. | Roy M. Rumbley 2 B | Lester Geisler 2 B | W. O. Dyer 2 B | J. A. Murray 5 B | |
| Johnstown, N. Y. | William Keaveney 1 M | Edward J. Mulvey 23 M | William E. Hughes 1‡ | Clarence Knowles 17 C | Evelyn Wilms 2 B r |
| Johnstown, Pa. | Harry Klink 2 | Harry Schultz 13 | George W. Griffith† | Charles Kunkle | Fulton Connor p |
| Joliet, Ill. | N. Fornango | J. O. Nygren | Sam E. Shepley† | | |
| Jonesboro, Ark. | W. C. Craig 17 M | L. E. Crockett 10 M | Herbert J. Bosler 12 E | Ed. Hill 25 B | |
| Joplin, Mo. | Harry Mead 1 C | T. F. Enright 1 C | John Saunders† | J. N. Wells | Kit Vickery B p |
| Kalamazoo, Mich. | Ralph Chapman 3 A | Maurice Welch* A | Edw. S. Clark A | Earl E. Norman 13 A | B. L. Gilbert 1 A p |
| Kankakee, Ill. | P. J. Duignan 2 M | John Berg 2 M | George Wulff† | George Huse | |
| Kansas City, Kans. | W. H. Stone 2 | Orlander Lind 31 | Henry F. Schaible 4 E† | J. D. Donovan | F. Leroy Cooke |
| Kansas City, Mo. | Otto Higgins 2 A | L. C. Johnson 9 A | Matt Murray 9 A | William Fleming 9 A | W. H. Dunn 25 B p |
| Kearny, N. J. | Philip T. Bell 12 C | Walter Scott 1 C | John M. Durkin† | Richard Dolphin* C | Phillip E. Alden 15 B p |
| Keene, N. H. | Harold E. Tibbetts 1 B | Eugene B. Riley 10 C | Arthur Wallace 22 C† | Paul F. Babbidge 47 C | Robert T. Kingsbury 9 C p |
| Kenmore, N. Y. | Clarence E. Yochum 14 C | Raymond J. Kirsch 6 C | Henry Schunk 11 C | | Henry A. Nadin r s |
| Kenosha, Wis. | John Sullivan 6 A | Fred Moeller 2 B | Robert M. Smith 1 A | Robert M. Smith 1 A | Floyd A. Carlson 9 A p |
| Keokuk, Iowa | E. C. McPherson 2 C | Joe C. Dobson C | Harry L. Ayres 3 E† | L. J. Kearns | Fred Reither‡ p |
| Kewanee, Ill. | J. D. Krumtinger 8 C | C. Walsh 8 C | C. C. Smith† | J. G. Thorne 4 C | B. E. Rose 4 B p |
| Key West, Fla. | Ivan Elwood 5 E | Harry M. Baker 3‡ | B. Curry Moreno† | William Cooper 6 M | |
| Kingsport, Tenn. | C. G. Crawford 2 A | Tom C. Warrick 18 A | | W. L. Webster | |
| Kingston, N. Y. | Allan Wood B | Joseph Murphy B | James Norton 2 B | W. D. Cashin B | |
| Kingston, Pa. | L. S. Reese 15‡ | Bill D. Brown 4‡ | William Martin† | William Lance | |
| Kinston, N. C. | W. M. Herbert | W. M. Herbert | Burwell Temple† | John E. Weyher | |
| Klamath Falls, Ore. | Frank Hamm 1‡ | W. T. Dean | E. A. Thomas† | | E. A. Thomas‡ p |
| Knoxville, Tenn. | Levi M. York 3‡ | C. M. Johnson 6‡ | H. J. Wight 2 A | M. B. Whitaker 7‡ | (Vacant) |
| Kokomo, Ind. | Charles O'Neill* M | R. F. Gammons* M | W. L. Stewart† | F. P. Stradling | Dan Reilly* M p |
| Lackawanna, N. Y. | Ray R. Gilson 2‡ | William Morrissey 2 C | Michael J. McGuire† | | |
| Laconia, N. H. | George N. Hubbard B | Arthur W. Spring | Harry L. Smith | Theodore L. Cate | Alfred C. Wyatt C p |
| La Crosse, Wis. | John B. Webber B | Fred C. McGlachlin B | Oscar J. Swennes 16 C | (Ex-officio Board) | George Ritter 17 B p |
| Lafayette, Ind. | Simon C. Edwards 1 M | William F. Koerner 1 M | Thomas Byrns, Jr.† | B. B. Caldwell 1 M | William W. Gibson 1 M p |
| Lafayette, La. | L. E. LeBlanc 4 M | Leo J. Gross 4 M | Wilson J. Peck 12 | Frank Ard 12‡ | P. Krauss 5 B pr |
| Lagrange, Ga. | O. H. Horn 1 M | C. W. Corless 1 M | G. H. Sargent 1 M | G. H. Sargent | J. B. Mann 1 M p |
| La Grange, Ill. | Harry McInnes 6 M | Harry McInnes 6 M | B. I. Greenlee 8 M | | O. C. Stenger rs |
| Lake Charles, La. | Samuel J. Iles, Jr. 2 | Fred Baumgarten 20 | J. Edgar Johnston 6† | G. A. Jernigan | J. Edgar Johnston 2 p |
| Lakeland, Fla. | R. V. Huchingson 2 A | Guy Arendell 19 A | John D. Freer† | Charles Larsen 12 | John D. Freer 8 A p |
| Lakewood, Ohio | L. B. Miller 13 M | C. A. Delaney 3 M | A. I. Kauffman | J. Quallich 6 M | A. B. Greenley 5 M p |
| Lancaster, Ohio | Gail Sesler‡ | Charles Kraft | W. E. Rowels† | Harry Stalder | I. M. Hankison B p |

## TABLE VIII-C.—DIRECTORY OF CITY OFFICIALS IN ALL CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued

| City | Police Chief | Fire Chief | Director of Public Works | Water Works Superintendent | Parks and Recreation Director |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lancaster, Pa. | A. F. Montgomery 1 C | Edward Shoemaker 1 C | J. F. Sweeton 3 E† | J. J. Malone 1 C | W. Hensel Brown 3 E p |
| Lansing, Mich. | Alfred Seymour 14 B | Hugo R. Delfs 26 B | J. C. Brandimore 2 M | Otto E. Eckert 8 B | H. Lee Bancroft 22 B p |
| La Porte, Ind. | Carl Baumgartner M | A. E. Homan 5 M | Harry F. Hoelocker† | Arthur Baker M | W. A. Cummings 30 M p |
| Laredo, Tex. | C. Mendiola 10 E | G. E. Renken 7‡ | F. Rodriguez† | | |
| La Salle, Ill. | Peter Walloch C | Richard Heilstedt C | Edward Byrne† | Edward Byrne | Frank J. Reinke E p |
| Latrobe, Pa. | George Brubaker 5 C | Charles Fagan 3 C | S. M. Bennett† | | |
| Laurel, Miss. | J. E. Brown 20 C | Garner Goodwin 2 C | J. C. Miller† | M. H. Freeman 2 C | Mrs. J. E. Pace 2 C p |
| Lawrence, Kans. | E. G. Pringle 1 M | Paul Ingels 3 M | F. D. Miller† | C. T. Hough | Edward A. Wood rs |
| Lawrence, Mass. | Charles R. Vose‡ | Francis A. Sullivan‡ | William H. Callahan‡ | Patrick S. Nugent‡ | John H. Brown‡ p |
| Lawton, Okla. | D. Moncrief, Jr. 8 E | George R. Pollard 2 M | Ed. Birtram† | W. H. Drover 2 M | (Board of 3) 2 M p |
| Leavenworth, Kans. | G. M. Stringfellow 2 M | Otto Geisler 10 M | John Dusay† | Arall H. Boyer 2 B | Samuel Donaldson p |
| Lebanon, Pa. | Harry Sealer C | John Zimmerman, Jr. 1 C | J. H. Greiner† | H. G. Louser 1 | Chester Pierce 3 E pr |
| Leominster, Mass. | John H. Mead 4 M | Ernest P. Johnson 5 M | F. Figenbaum 5 M† | W. Guy Classon 16 B | David E. Bassett 20 M p |
| Lewiston, Me. | John H. Ashton 10 C | Reuben Estes 2 C | A. G. Roy 2 B | Louis Trial 1 B | |
| Lewistown, Pa. | Arthur E. Beal* C | Nelson Yearick 4‡ | Harry E. Fetterolf† | W. G. Rarie | |
| Lexington, Ky. | Ernest Thompson 8 | C. J. Henry 5 | J. White Guyn 22 A | F. E. Beck | Tom Robinson 1 A p |
| Lima, Ohio | Ward Taylor 1 M | John Mack 10 M | W. L. McClain† | E. E. Smith 1 M | H. Loecher M p |
| Lincoln, Ill. | William Thompson* M | Thomas Watson 4 M | Harry C. Spitler† | B. P. Hallock | Fred D. Stiles rs |
| Lincoln, Nebr. | W. C. Condit 2 C | L. Hansen 12 C | E. M. Bair† | Paul W. Doerr 2 E | C. E. Ager 2 C p |
| Lincoln, R. I. | James H. Axon 15 C | | | | |
| Lincoln Park, Mich. | Charles Barker 4 B | Adolph Fernelius 7 B | Grover Laney 2 B | William Raupp 2 E | Oral Greenfield 2 E r |
| Linden, N. J. | Frank Hickey 6 C | F. Miller 9 C | James Davison† | | |
| Little Falls, N. Y. | Jas J. Long 40 B | E. J. Cooney 35 | Frank O'Hara† | Ralph Austin 9 M | Ralph Austin 9 M p |
| Little Rock, Ark. | J. L. Bennett 4 M | C. A. Burns 2 M | | S. R. Brough | R. C. Rudisell 4 M p |
| Lockport, N. Y. | William A. Burbank B | E. J. Coyle B | Raymond Noble 1 M† | L. J. Hooker C | Nelson Goehle B p |
| Lodi, N. J. | Henry R. Witte 19 M | James Ferrara 1 M | Daniel Cody 24 M† | Joseph Branca 19 M | |
| Logansport, Ind. | Joseph A. Carson 5 M | William Claiborne 5 M | William O. Fiedler 5 E | L. E. Fiedler 5 M | William Ensfield 5 M |
| Long Beach, Calif. | J. H. McClelland 2 A | A. C. DuRee 2 A | E. M. Edwards* A | Fred Porter 3 B | Otto Beyer 1 A p |
| Long Branch, N. J. | Frederick Wardell 1 B | George Sperling*‡ | William I. Rosenfeld 2 B | Jacob Herr | J. William Jones 3 E p |
| Longview, Wash. | Harry Lewis* M | H. H. Clarke 8 M | Jack Jones† | A. H. Labsap | |
| Lorain, Ohio | Theodore Walker 25 M | David E. Hatt 25 M | A. M. Pollock 1 M | C. A. Pauly 19‡ | George J. Crehore 1 B p |
| Los Angeles, Calif. | James E. Davis 2 B | Ralph J. Scott 16 B | Hugh J. McGuire† | H. A. VanNorman 28 B | Frank Shearer p |
| Louisville, Ky. | Edward P. Callahan 1 M | Edw. A. McHugh 1 M | Roy W. Burks 1 M | Harry A. Volz 1 B | Joseph D. Scholtz 1 M p |
| Lowell, Mass. | Hugh Downey 8 M | James J. Sullivan 6 M | George R. Legrande 4 M† | Thomas P. McDermott 1 M | John W. Kernan 22 B p |
| Lubbock, Tex. | H. L. Johnston 1 M | W. E. Twetty 9 M | R. F. Houk† | R. F. Houk 8 M | C. D. McGhee 3 M p |
| Lynbrook, N. Y. | Anthony H. Heimers 2 C | William Scheihing 2‡ | Raymond Morgan 2 B | | |
| Lynchburg, Va. | D. C. Smith 40 A | L. B. Rapp 38 A | M. D. Knight, Jr. 10 A | Richard F. Wagner 12 A | George H. Reed 20 A p |
| Lynn, Mass. | James H. Broad 5 M | William F. Welch 3 M | Thomas Smith 9 C | Thomas W. Heath 9 C | John Morrissey 19‡ p |
| McAlester, Okla. | Tom J. Abbott 2 A | E. H. Miller 10 A | V. G. Thompson 3 C | J. W. Heatley 21 A | V. G. Thompson 3 C p |
| McComb, Miss. | D. A. Brumfield 4 C | Sam Bellipanni 15 C | W. O. Rutledge 4 E | J. W. W. Conerly 24 C | |
| McKeesport, Pa. | John J. Whalen 6 M | Albert Watson 1 M | J. C. Zwingler 11 E† | A. J. Richards 11 E | Ben Rosenberg 1 E pr |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| McKees Rocks, Pa. | M. F. Matsey | J. J. Thuer | B. H. Arent† | | |
| Macon, Ga. | Ben T. Watkins 9 C | V. C. Shepard 2 B | Theodore W. Ellis† | J. J. Leslie* B | T. C. James 9 C p |
| Madison, Wis. | William H. McCormick 4 B | John Lahm 6 B | (Board of 3) | Leon A. Smith 18 B | Mike Quann 17 B p |
| Mahanoy City, Pa. | A. P. McLaughlin 18 C | Dennis Klitsch 1 C | Michael Sullivan† | William J. Faust | |
| Malden, Mass. | John H. Aylward 17 B | William J. Dooling 3 B | Dennis P. Sullivan 10 B | Dennis P. Sullivan 10 B | Daniel E. Connell 30 B p |
| Mamaroneck, N. Y. | Charles H. Stowell 5 C | Fred G. Becker 1 C | R. M. Robins 4 A | W. E. Thrasher | William L. Gedney 9 A p |
| Manchester, N. H. | Michael J. Healy 43 B | Charles H. French 18 B | Daniel F. Cronin† | Percy A. Shaw 2 B | Thomas Sweeney 4 B p |
| Manhattan, Kans. | A. R. Scheleen 1 M | C. L. Morris 1 M | Hurst Majors 3 E† | L. W. Fielding 1‡ | |
| Manitowoc, Wis. | Anton Trochlell 15 B | James Keeplic 10 B | Theodore Staeffler† | E. C. Schroeder 17 B | Edward Pasewalk 18 C p |
| Mankato, Minn. | Pat Henry 2 C | Ben E. Bangerter 20 C | A. Magin | C. F. Barnum 6 E | M. G. Knoff 4 E p |
| Mansfield, Ohio | William Lauer 3 M | Charles Seeburger 2 M | James F. Corrigan 1 M | (Vacant) | Jacob Rahm 3 M p |
| Maplewood, Mo. | Joseph E. Kavanaugh 2 C | Joseph E. Kavanaugh 2 C | H. G. McClure E | William B. Henly | |
| Marietta, Ohio | Homer O. Wolff 9 M | George Holst 24 M | Clarence Robinson 1 M | Clarence Robinson 1 M | Clarence Robinson 1 M p |
| Marinette, Wis. | Fred Schultz 10 C | Otto Hackbarth 10 C | Edward White 6 M | F. H. King | Joseph Doyle 2 M p |
| Marion, Ind. | Frank Brandon 4 M | Burr Hamilton 4 M | William E. White† | Sam VanCleave 4 M | Simon Smith 4 B p |
| Marion, Ohio | E. C. Mackan‡ | T. J. McFarland 25‡ | C. K. Mercer 1 M | George Wysall | |
| Marlborough, Mass. | Francis Bastien 7 M | Samuel Daoust 7 M | J. Francis Granger 5 M | Harold L. Brigham 1 B | |
| Marquette, Mich. | T. T. Hurley 6 C | W. J. Johnston 20 C | Fred G. Hawken 5 C p | W. J. Johnston 20 C | Fred G. Hawken 5 C p |
| Marshall, Tex. | C. M. Ezel 7 A | Sam Lindsay 14 A | W. C. Albright 7 A | W. C. Albright 7 A | |
| Marshalltown, Iowa | H. F. Block 1 M | C. C. Pigman 16 M | George Herman† | H. V. Pedersen 8 B | C. C. Jennings 6 M p |
| Martinsburg, W. Va. | O. T. Wilson 6 M | R. S. Snyder 2 M | David Thompson† | C. B. Grimes 6 M | |
| Martins Ferry, Ohio | J. W. Muhleman 6‡ | Clyde Cecil 2‡ | O. C. Frantz 2 M | E. D. Jenkins 10 B | |
| Mason City, Iowa | E. J. Patton 2 A | D. H. Shire 8 A | E. H. Crofoot 2 C | E. H. Crofoot 13 A | E. H. Crofoot A p |
| Massena, N. Y. | Floyd Sanjule 7 C | Frank Morrill | O. T. McGuiggan 6 C | B. J. Cummings 7 C | |
| Massillon, Ohio | Edward M. Ertle 40 M | Edward Hunsinger 10 M | Adrian P. Howald 2 M | A. A. Ulrich 4‡ | Homer Snyder 1 M p |
| Mattoon, Ill. | Homer Brimberry 2 M | J. C. Weaver 10 M | Albert Huckaba 2 M† | John Goetz 2 M | |
| Maywood, Ill. | Richard H. Bailey 5 C | G. Humphreville 1 C | L. H. Sweeney† | Charles Davis 29 C | L. H. Sweeney 6 C p |
| Meadville, Pa. | L. M. Hays 9‡ | Charles Smalenberger 30‡ | A. W. Ellsworth | Harry Ellsworth 35 C | George Francis 9‡ p |
| Medford, Mass. | D. W. Connor 4 M | Thomas A. Qualey 17 M | James C. Gillis 2 M | Henry F. Hughes 20 M | Patrick W. McNally 2 B p |
| Medford, Ore. | Clatous McCredie 8 M | Roy Elliott 11 M | F. W. Scheffel† | Robert Duff 5 B | |
| Melrose, Mass. | Louis B. Heaton 9 M | Frank C. Newman 12 M | Fred E. Ellis 3 M | Fred E. Ellis | George W. Rogers 7 C p |
| Melrose Park, Ill. | A. H. Lerseberg 6 M | A. Prignano 2 M | Paul Sarritello† | L. S. Widney 4 M | |
| Memphis, Tenn. | Will D. Lee 7 B | Irby Klink 2 B | Oscar I. Kruger 7 E† | C. M. McCord 3 B | Davis Kenfrow 4 B p |
| Menominee, Mich. | Frank Parsek 4 C | L. C. Collins 35 C | Daniel Potter† | R. J. Campbell 18 B | |
| Meriden, Conn. | Michael B. Carroll | John Moroney | James A. Toner 3 | C. Perry Prann | George Baer rs |
| Meridian, Miss. | B. F. Hyde 1 C | W. F. C. Partin 10 C | G. Rumley† | Charles E. May 2 E | Frank McDonald 2 C p |
| Methuen, Mass. | Joseph Hutchinson 1 C | Thomas Dow 10 C | John Austin† | Thomas Mahoney 14 B | John Learned 7 E p |
| Miami, Fla. | S. D. McCreary 5 A | E. A. Westra 4 A | William Sydow 4 A | W. L. Black 11‡ | Myron G. Murray 2‡ p |
| Michigan City, Ind. | Joe Wolf* M | I. C. Bauman M | William W. Swart† | P. C. Gale 3 B | Frank Sodenworer 3 B p |
| Middlesborough, Ky. | Charles H. Minton 8 C | R. M. Knipp 15 C | H. B. Stallard 1 E | J. H. Woodson | W. P. Creswell rs |
| Middletown, Conn. | Charles A. Anderson 10 M | Michael W. Lawton 8 M | G. Allen Schaefer 11 M | G. Allen Schaefer 11 M | Patrick M. Kidney 8 B p |
| Middletown, N. Y. | Percy Bennett 21 M | William M. Seeley 9‡ | Justin F. Gates 4 M | Justin F. Gates 4 M | Frederic Singer 3 B r |
| Middletown, Ohio | Roy W. Scofield 3‡ | Elmer F. Reed 16‡ | Fred Wigginton† | Earl Gebhart 18‡ | Olin F. Pegg 1‡ p |
| Milford, Mass. | John J. Moloney 11‡ | J. J. Fahey 4 C | E. C. Beaulac 13 E | John W. Kay | (Board of 3) E p |
| Millville, N. J. | Harry Jones | Thomas R. Carson 7 C | Howard Zimmerman 2 E | W. Fred Ware | W. Fred Ware 14 E |
| Milton, Mass. | Timothy McDermott 1 | J. Harry Holmes 21 C | Forrest J. Maynard† | D. A. Heffernan 32 B | J. L. Kelly 15 B p |
| Milwaukee, Wis. | J. G. Laubenheimer 14 M | P. J. Steinkellner 9 M | R. E. Stoelting 11 M | Henry Bohmann 23‡ | Charles Hauserman 4‡ p |

### Table VIII-C.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Police Chief | Fire Chief | Director of Public Works | Water Works Superintendent | Parks and Recreation Director |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Minneapolis, Minn. | Michael J. Johannes 2 M | Earl A. Trager 2‡ | Elmer Lund† | J. A. Jensen‡ | Theodore Wirth 30 B p |
| Minot, N. D. | Howard Garrison 2 A | J. J. O'Leary 7 A | S. K. Svenkeson 2 A† | S. K. Svenkeson 4 A | Clyde Wilson 1 B p r |
| Mishawaka, Ind. | James L. Guy* M | Marshall Potts 5 M | Ted C. Garns* M† | A. R. Klein 20 M | Ted C. Garns* M p |
| Missoula, Mont. | Paul D. Wilcox 1 C | James T. Cranney 17 C | Roy Hamilton 2 C† | H. S. Thane | Roy Hamilton 2 C p |
| Mitchell, S. D. | A. L. Kirkpatrick 10 M | Asa B. Wheeler 6 M | Clarence Black† | J. C. Scallin 9 M | W. E. Webb 12 B p r |
| Moberly, Mo. | J. B. McAdams 2 E | Mose Alexander 6 M | J. E. Bell† | Carl Haynes 5 B | John Groeber 5 B p |
| Mobile, Ala. | Warren F. Burch | Gus Rhem | W. H. Merrifield† | T. C. White | |
| Modesto, Calif. | Lee E. Smith 17 C | George E. Wallace 24 C | H. L. Rogers 4 E | F. J. Rossi 11 C | J. E. DonCarlos 4 C p |
| Moline, Ill. | Ben DeJaeger 26 C | John Q. Hawk 26 C | Robert Benell† | A. E. Anderson 17 M | Raymond DeRycke 2 M p |
| Monessen, Pa. | Joseph Lescanac 1 C | William B. Laird 12 C | | | John F. Butler 7 E p |
| Monroe, La. | L. V. Tarver 24‡ | F. J. Roddy 22‡ | T. C. Mahr† | J. K. Brothers 20‡ | L. diBenedetto r |
| Monroe, Mich. | Jesse Fisher 1 C | Edmond Dubois C | Nick J. Rohan† | Stuart M. Weaver 9 | L. W. Reaume 1 E p |
| Monrovia, Calif. | F. L. Scott 9 C | Fred Minyard | C. E. Emberson 2 C | C. W. Given 13 C | F. W. Cole C p |
| Montclair, N. J. | Edward F. Reilly 23‡ | John H. Graham 33‡ | John J. Picken 3 E | Otto A. Feth 3‡ | William A. Shaw 3 p |
| Montgomery, Ala. | W. H. Taylor 16 C | C. L. Ingram 8 C | J. M. Jones† | F. G. Salter 1 C | R. L. Todd 16 C p |
| Morgantown, W. Va. | C. W. Smith 13 A | John R. Hare 17 A | Elmer W. Prince 8 C† | Elmer W. Prince | Helen White* B r |
| Morristown, N. J. | Fred Roff 1 C | John Cullinan 5 C | Thomas J. Dolan† | W. Parsons Todd* E | Thomas J. Dolan 5‡ p |
| Moundsville, W. Va. | Frank H. Patton 2 E | Charles Cunningham 8‡ | C. Leroy Bonar† | Menton Hetzer | |
| Mount Carmel, Pa. | Joseph Chesney* C | John Dugan 1‡ | William Hancock, Sr.† | August Pavis* C | Ben Glowacki* C p |
| Mount Clemens, Mich. | Arthur Rosso 4‡ | C. Edward Willert 4‡ | August Klockow† | J. A. Keils 10‡ | August Klockow 10‡ p |
| Mount Vernon, Ill. | Wilson Lively 2 M | M. L. Baker 2 M | O. M. Newby† | C. A. Steinhouser | James Wells 2 M p |
| Mount Vernon, N. Y. | M. I. Silverstein 32‡ | John Gibson 18‡ | Richard E. Stinson 3 M | Howard Wolbert 11‡ | Walter Cammack 3 B r |
| Muncie, Ind. | Frank Massey 6 M | Earl Babb 1 M | William J. Daniels† | Clayton E. Stewart | O. W. Crabbs 1 M p |
| Munhall, Pa. | O. E. McNaughton 12 C | Edward M. Cox 20 C | J. A. Fertig 15 C† | | |
| Muscatine, Iowa | W. E. Longstreth 2 M | J. J. Brown 14 M | Robert Dale† | William Molis 15 B | |
| Muskegon, Mich. | Peter Hanson 20 A | Chris Smith 18 A | | Joseph Cardinal 10 A | Ernie Hollman 10 A p |
| Muskegon Heights, Mich. | Tony Joslyn 4 M | H. L. Ridout 1 M | J. T. Wilson 8 A† | R. Sampason 5 A | |
| Muskogee, Okla. | B. L. Bolton 3 A | Henry Sager 4 A | Max Williams 4 A† | W. P. Johnson 20 A | G. W. Palmer 20 B p |
| Nanticoke, Pa. | V. Zuanecki 1‡ | S. Puckey 2‡ | Frank Pelarek 6 E† | James H. Coppin | S. Ostrowski 2 E p |
| Nashua, N. H. | Irving F. Goodwin 16‡ | Albert C. Melendy 4‡ | William H. Tolles 15 | William F. Sullivan | William R. Kirkpatrick p |
| Nashville, Tenn. | J. Lon Foster 10 M | Frank B. Moore 10 M | W. H. Peebles† | Robert L. Lawrence, Jr. 6 M | George B. Moulder 12 B p |
| Natchez, Miss. | M. P. Ryan | | W. H. Wilson† | M. G. Stewart | |
| Natick, Mass. | Thomas P. Evans‡ | John Neary‡ | Arthur Boardman E | William Leahy‡ | Edward Mann E p |
| Naugatuck, Conn. | John Adamson B | Milton Galvin 1 B | James Brophy 1 B | William H. Moody | |
| Needham, Mass. | Arthur P. Bliss 7 C | T. Robert Quinlan 8 C | Lester C. Hollis 1C | Roger G. Oakman 3 C | |
| New Albany, Ind. | Edward H. Meyer 1 M | John Feiock 1 M | Walter Medlock 1 M† | F. Albert Schaeffer | |
| Newark, N. J. | James A. McRell 13‡ | John J. Towey 9‡ | Pearce R. Franklin 1 E | William G. Bank | |
| Newark, Ohio | Curtis I. Berry 2 M | Stanley Shaw 1 M | Guy W. Lawyer 3 M | Guy W. Lawyer | Guy W. Lawyer 3 M p |
| New Bedford, Mass. | Samuel D. MacLeod 9 | Edward F. Dahill 21 | William P. Hammersley† | Stephen H. Taylor | |
| New Bern, N. C. | A. L. Bryan 2 E | F. H. Whitty, Jr. C | Carter Tisdale† | F. G. Godfroy C | |
| New Britain, Conn. | William C. Hart B | William Noble B | Joseph O'Brien† | James M. Lynch | Clyde Ellingwood B p r |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New Brunswick, N. J. | George Cox 2 C | Louis Sass 20 C | F. F. Richardson 1 C | Charles H. Morris 16 C | Thomas Baker 12 C p |
| Newburgh, N. Y. | Fred G. Brown 19 C | P. L. T. Van Tienen A | Robert Todd† | Charles B. Gilcrist 25 A | Walter Haible 13 A p |
| Newburyport, Mass. | James E. Sullivan 2 M | John F. Cutter 3 M | James E. Ronan† | Harold S. Noyes 1 B | Patrick F. Hartnett 8 M p |
| New Castle, Ind. | George G. Ballard 5 M | George Van Zant 5 M | William Williams 13 M | Charles E. Scholl 9 M | Guy C. Strong 4 M p |
| New Castle, Pa. | J. F. Haven 3 C | C. H. Stockman 2 C | B. F. Butler 1 E | J. L. Mathews | J. D. Alexander 1 E p |
| New Haven, Conn. | Philip T. Smith 22 M | Lawrence E. Reif 9 M | John M. Golden 3 M | F. J. Callahan | Walter L. Wirth 5 B p |
| New Kensington, Pa. | Dan Zeloyle 1 C | Edward Clawson 1 C | Sam Heister† | James G. Griffiths | |
| New London, Conn. | William T. Babcock 2 A | Thomas H. Shipman A | George E. Watters 13 | George E. Watters 14 A | C. R. Darrow 14 A p |
| New Orleans, La. | George Reyer 5‡ | John W. Evans 5‡ | Joseph P. Skelly 5 E | Alfred Theard B | M. Montreuil B p |
| New Philadelphia, Ohio | Emery H. Gintz 12‡ | Walter T. Banning 8‡ | T. H. Edwards 1 M | George Souers 25‡ | W. E. Geiser 10 B p |
| Newport, Ky. | D. M. Murphy* A | Edward Miles 5 A | A. H. Root 3 A | Thomas A. McGeough 1 A | |
| Newport, R. I. | Patrick J. Furey 2 M | Joseph S. Lawton 8 C | Harry R. Hamilton* C | Bradford Norman | John J. Sullivan, Jr. 4 B p |
| Newport News, Va. | W. E. Mahone 4 A | J. H. Donelly 4 A | J. A. McCarthy 5 A | E. F. Dugger 9 B | |
| New Rochelle, N. Y. | Frank L. Bermingham 5‡ | Oscar A. Grab 2‡ | Bert J. Young 3 A | E. T. Cranch | Charles Broder 8‡ p |
| Newton, Iowa | L. E. Simpson 15 M | E. H. Gibson 6 M | N. S. Singley† | J. O. Leary 16 C | Edgar Hotchkiss 6 B p |
| Newton, Kans. | R. D. McGinnis 4‡ | F. P. Moore 18 A | Knowland L. Brode 4 C | Roll Ginter | Floyd Havens 4 A p |
| Newton, Mass. | Michael T. Hughes 5 M | Clarence W. Randlett 11 M | Richard H. Ellis 1 M | Joseph W. Murray 1 M | Charles A. Mahoney 1 M p |
| New York, N. Y. | Lewis J. Valentine* M | John J. McElligott 1 M | (One each borough) | Maurice P. Davidson 1 M | Robert Moses 1 M p |
| Niagara Falls, N. Y. | John A. Curry 19 A | George A. Wood 6 A | O. C. Butler† | O. C. Butler 3 A | Ward W. Dean 1 A p |
| Niles, Mich. | George Francis 37 M | C. S. Collins 13 M | E. F. Crabill 18 | E. F. Crabill 18 | |
| Niles, Ohio | Charles Nicholas 8‡ | J. H. Swager‡ | Edward Clare 4 M | Bert Holloway 29 B | George Hayman 1 B p |
| Norfolk, Nebr. | C. E. Blatt 2 M | John Boehnke 8‡ | Arnold Pasewalk† | Frank Carrick 14 E | Tom LeRay 17 B p |
| Norfolk, Va. | Charles B. Borland 1 A | R. S. Baughan 7 A | W. H. Taylor, III 16 A | Charles H. Bliven 16‡ | W. J. Twiford 13‡ p |
| Norristown, Pa. | George Bausewine 5 C | George W. Pifer 2 C | Samuel Hart† | W. B. Russell | S. C. Corson 4 C p |
| North Adams, Mass. | M. W. Conlon 9 M | J. E. Saulnier 10 M | J. P. Miller 10 M | John P. Miller | (Board of 5) 5 M r |
| Northampton, Mass. | Bartholomew Bresnahan 7 M | John L. Lucier 7 M | James R. Martin 5 M | Albert H. Tillson 12 B | M. Foss Norum p |
| North Attleborough, Mass. | Frank P. Toner 20 C | Ralph Robertson 5 C | Nathan Phipps† | Clifton Carpenter 1 B | William Young 3 E p |
| North Braddock, Pa. | Walter R. Pennington 1 C | Louis Berdell | M. A. Droske 1 C | | |
| North Little Rock, Ark. | Gabe Pratt 4 M | Roy N. Nichols 10 M | Glenn Douglas 1 | S. L. Brough | Clara Weed 5 M r |
| North Platte, Nebr. | James Bechan 1 M | E. E. Schram 12 M | W. B. Salisbury† | Frank Kroehler 1 E | W. B. Brown M p |
| North Providence, R. I. | William J. Donovan* C | Clarence H. Broley | P. Notorantonio E | Charles A. Maguire | Carl Rasmussen C p |
| North Tonawanda, N. Y. | Fred Hoefert 9 B | Fred Knight 6 B | Mathew J. Robinson† | A. P. Smith 1 M | W. L. Ramsey rs |
| Norwalk, Conn. | Jeremiah Dorney 1 B | George W. Bogardus 21 C | John O'Donnell 1 C† | | |
| Norwich, Conn. | Thomas Murphy | Henry Taft | Edward Gleason† | J. A. Fitzgerald | Matthew J. Sheridan rs |
| Norwood, Mass. | William H. Sullivan 9‡ | Alonzo N. Earle 3 C | Joseph E. Conley 6 A | Joseph E. Conley 6 A | Joseph E. Conley 6 A p |
| Norwood, Ohio | Thomas Q. Jenike 8 M | James Doherty 5 M | William F. Reinhardt 1 M | | W. Allen Stone 1 M p |
| Nutley, N. J. | William J. Brown 10 C | D. C. Decker 3 C | Fredrick H. Young 3 E | Joseph VanTreek 6 C | G. B. Philhower 4 C p |
| Oakland, Calif. | B. A. Wallman 1 A | William G. Lutkey 7 A | W. M. Frickstad† | John S. Longwell | Lee S. Kerfoot 21 B p |
| Oak Park, Ill. | Benjamin Barsema 7 M | W. C. Watters 8 M | D. C. Meyers 12 M | D. C. Meyers 12 M | G. A. Lindberg‡ p |
| Ogden, Utah | Rial C. Moore 1 M | Nobel J. Hinton 1 M | George C. O'Connor 1 E | Fred E. Williams 7 E | Fred E. Williams 7 E p |
| Ogdensburg, N. Y. | Herbert S. Myers 10 M | Francis Cadieux 1 M | Charles H. Lord† | Charles H. Lord 17‡ | Charles H. Lord 17‡ p |
| Oil City, Pa. | E. Nugent 27 C | A. G. Dolby 30 C | W. W. Dimond 5 E† | A. Martin 2 C | J. A. Angove 2 E p |
| Oklahoma City, Okla. | John Watt 4 A | George Goff 20 A | C. D. Holt† | Thomas G. Banks 4 A | Donald Gordon 2 A p |
| Okmulgee, Okla. | Harry Donnell 1 M | P. H. Eisenbeis 3 M | Walter Wheatley 9 E | Ernest Skinner 20‡ | Walter Wheatley 9 E p |
| Old Forge, Pa. | Primo Ceasre | Frank McHugh | Frank Notari‡ | | |
| Olean, N. Y. | J. C. Dempsey 20 M | L. G. Rodgers 25 M | S. J. Biracree† | S. D. Poarch 6 M | A. W. Buley rs |

## Table VIII-C.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Police Chief | Fire Chief | Director of Public Works | Water Works Superintendent | Parks and Recreation Director |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Olympia, Wash. | John M. Walker* M | R. E. Holcomb 6 M | Edward C. Dohm* C | Charles H. Williams 6 C | James McGuigan 6 C p |
| Olyphant, Pa. | Joseph Mihalik‡ | John Ohatmsky | Jacob Baldinger† | George F. Owens | |
| Omaha, Nebr. | Robert Samardick 3 C | Arthur W. Olsen 3 C | Harry Knudsen† | Theodore L. Gleason 15 B | Frank L. Frost 3 E p |
| Oneida, N. Y. | Allie Murphy 1‡ | Fred Kopple 2‡ | George F. Wilcox 6 M | Henry M. White 20 B | Henry Brophy rs |
| Oneonta, N. Y. | F. N. Horton 15‡ | M. H. Stapleton 8‡ | E. H. Bull 10 B | W. W. Watkins 6 B | W. E. Long rs |
| Ontario, Calif | J. L. Loch 1 C | J. H. Gordon 3 C | Austin Burt† | Austin Burt 7 C | Austin Burt 7 C p |
| Orange, N. J. | Joseph McGonnell 14‡ | Jeremiah Savage*‡ | John J. Condron 10 C | Fred Luthy 17‡ | Ovid C. Bianchi 1 C r |
| Orlando, Fla. | Frank Karel, Sr. 1 C | William Dean 24 C | Laurence Brown 3 C | L. B. Fort 2‡ | A. T. Coith 6 C p |
| Oshkosh, Wis. | Arthur Gabbert 16 B | George Revland C | Frank Haidlinger 2 M | Albert Hintz B | R. C. Miller B r |
| Oskaloosa, Iowa | H. R. Allgood 2 M | M. C. Whitmore 5‡ | Thomas A. Carlin† | V. B. Trueblood 6 B | |
| Ossining, N. Y. | N. J. Murphy 30‡ | Duane C. Byble 2 E | F. D. Grannis† | Wallace T. Miller 2‡ | Mary M. Halpin 8‡ r |
| Oswego, N. Y. | Thomas W. Mowatt 19 B | Monte Lass 12 B | J. Francis Gill 15 M | William A. McCaffrey 19 B | J. Francis Gill M p |
| Ottawa, Ill. | F. L. McNamara 3 C | Joseph Boissenin 18 C | J. F. Bulger 4 E | H. A. Tolburg 8 C | P. J. Meagher 8 E p |
| Ottumwa, Iowa | Wilbourn Hicks 4‡ | Bernard Meany 4‡ | John L. Davies† | Horace A. Brown 20 B | J. R. McDonald 4‡ p |
| Owensboro, Ky. | R. Thornsberry 12 | Ed. Cureton 20 | Mike Dieterlee† | Adam Bishop 2 C | |
| Owosso, Mich. | T. A. Rice 5 C | Claud Craig 14 C | W. A. Wright 8 E | Walter Bennet 1 E | |
| Paducah, Ky. | W. E. Bryant 3 A | J. M. Slaughter 18 A | W. F. Anderson 10 A | H. C. Mitchell 20 B | R. L. Nelson 5 B p |
| Painesville, Ohio | P. J. Appleton 17 A | L. J. Elliott 13 A | Gay G. Elliott† | F. C. Campbell 2 A | |
| Palestine, Tex. | J. M. Johnston‡ | H. H. Padon‡ | S. R. Buchanan† | J. H. Handorf | |
| Palo Alto, Calif. | H. A. Zink 11 B | William Clemo 16 B | Oscar Campbell 2 C | D. P. McLachlan 18‡ | Charles F. Miller 12‡ p |
| Pampa, Tex. | Art Hurst 1 A | Clyde Gold 4 A | L. P. Duvall† | A. J. Crooker 10 A | L. P. Duvall 9 A p |
| Paris, Tex. | Gus Cothran 4 | Jodie Moss 13 M | Guy Teague† | W. F. Hicks 11 M | |
| Parkersburg, W. Va. | C. H. Watson 7 M | Lloyd Layman 5 M | George W. Abels† | George Huber 9 E | George W. Abels 3 E p |
| Park Ridge, Ill. | Harold Johnson 6 M | Joe Roentreter 2‡ | Fred Diesness† | Fred Ashley 4 M | W. W. Hinckley 10 E p |
| Parma, Ohio | Garry Burczyk | E. T. Woolway | William Wintrich M | | Espes Kraimer M r |
| Parsons, Kans. | Earle Johnston 4 M | Walter A. Buel 39 M | Ira Gibson 2 E† | Ira White 6‡ | C. J. Mills rs |
| Pasadena, Calif. | Charles H. Kelley 14 A | E. F. Coop 16 A | Harvey W. Hincks† | S. B. Morris 23 A | G. L. Skutt 11 A p |
| Passaic, N. J. | Thomas E. Kennedy 1‡ | William Nelson*‡ | Mary L. McGuire 2 E | A. T. Cook | Michael Rean 16‡ p |
| Paterson, N. J. | John Murphy 3 B | Thomas Coyle 23 B | John Shortell 7‡ | A. T. Cook | Robert McCrowe 15 B p |
| Pawtucket, R. I. | Leonard Mills 1 C | Napoleon Taupier 2 C | Albert J. Lamarre 2 C | Albert J. Lamarre | Lawrence Corrente 2‡ p |
| Peabody, Mass. | Edward F. Pierce 10 M | William C. Mahoney 14 M | R. W. Macdonald† | Charles Crump 5 M | George Coyle rs |
| Peekskill, N. Y. | John Shea 26 C | James McGuire 3 | | James Wood | John Devine rs |
| Pekin, Ill. | Harry Donahue* M | Julius Jaeckel 50 M | Fred Gebhardt, Sr.† | Walter E. Lautz | Ben F. Smith B p |
| Pensacola, Fla. | William O'Connell 2 A | W. R. Bicker 3 A | George J. Roark 3 C | J. L. Sweeney 3 A | G. M. Quigley 1 A p |
| Peoria, Ill. | Walter W. Williams 2 M | Charles M. Donnelly 2 M | John F. McKiernan 2 M | Ray Crozier | William Rosenberger 7 B p |
| Perth Amboy, N. J. | J. E. Gutowski‡ | P. F. Campbell E | A. S. Gadek, Jr. E | Samuel J. Mason‡ | T. J. Patten‡ p |
| Peru, Ind. | E. R. Hobbs 4 M | Carl Ahnert 4 M | Frank McGuire† | Floyd Kerns 4 C | |
| Petersburg, Va. | W. W. Jefferson 6 A | W. T. Miller 13 A | W. T. Mulcaha† | Charles W. Davis 10 A | Roland C. Day 1 A pr |
| Phenix City, Ala. | O. O. Gay C | H. M. Newsome C | | H. B. McLaren‡ | |
| Philadelphia, Pa. | Joseph A. LeStrange 2‡ | Ross B. Davis 15‡ | Frank Cavan 7 M | Thomas Hayes 7 M | Alan Corson 20 B p |
| Phillipsburg, N. J. | Walter Cutsler 12 C | E. Koocker 18 C | William R. Potts† | Thomas Thomas 15 B | Ed. Deitrick 1 E p |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Phoenix, Ariz. | George O. Brisbois A | Frank Cockrane A | James Girand† | B. M. Atwood A | George H. Hillis B p |
| Phoenixville, Pa. | C. M. Mower 1 M | Harry R. Walker 2‡ | Norman G. Young 5 C | Norman G. Young 5 C | Roy Holden 6 B r |
| Pine Bluff, Ark. | M. L. Gallagher M | George Alford M | A. S. Maupin† | R. J. Rhinehart | |
| Piqua, Ohio | Frank Gehle 32 A | P. J. Caulfield 32 A | L. G. Whitney 1 A | Forest Rauscher 1 A | J. E. Wells 1 A p |
| Pittsburg, Kans. | A. R. Armstrong 20 C | Thomas W. Howe 2 C | Clint Rankin† | W. J. Lapworth 24 C | O. E. Burke 2 C p |
| Pittsburgh, Pa. | Jacob F. Dorsey 1‡ | Richard L. Smith 7‡ | Leslie M. Johnston 2 M | J. H. Kennon 5‡ | R. E. Griswold 1‡ p |
| Pittsfield, Mass. | John L. Sullivan 19‡ | Thomas F. Burke 2 M | Arthur B. Farnham 1 M | Charles Biladeau 17‡ | Napoleon A. Langlois 4 B p |
| Pittston, Pa. | Luke Keating, Jr. 6 C | Emil Weber 6 C | Louis Seebel 6 E | | Leo Sheporartis 3 E p |
| Plainfield, N. J. | Charles A. Flynn 4 M | Wesley J. Dunn 12 M | Charles Bush† | F. L. Winslow | Roy O. Schlenter 7 B r |
| Plattsburg, N. Y. | Clifford Fleming 1 M | Eli Z. Seymour 18 M | Thomas G. Burke 18 M | Thomas G. Burke 18 M | Thomas G. Burke 18 M p |
| Pleasantville, N. J. | Belleville Naylor | W. J. Hudson | Jesse B. Hackney† | | |
| Plymouth, Mass. | Russell P. Dearborn | Albert E. Hiller | Elmer C. Chandler† | Arthur E. Blackmer | |
| Plymouth, Pa. | Lawrence Kendig 5 C | Thompson Maggs 2 | Lawrence Evans† | Samuel Brokenshire | |
| Pocatello, Idaho | J. L. Balderston 3 M | G. W. Mathews 1 M | R. F. Hamilton† | C. M. Rainey 16 M | W. L. Raymond 8 M p |
| Pomona, Calif. | W. S. Kirby 6 C | A. E. Cooke 6 C | F. C. Froehde† | Frank C. Pedley 4 C | Charles B. Wall 2 C p |
| Ponca City, Okla. | Joe McFadden 2 C | George K. Brown 30 C | Ira Taylor† | Pat Schlesinger | P. J. Bellinghausen 9 C p |
| Pontiac, Mich. | Charles McMillan* A | Frank W. Kuhn 18 A | L. M. Wrenn 3 A | H. L. Monroe 24 A | A. K. Braidwood 5 A p |
| Port Angeles, Wash. | Robert Banderob 3 M | C. A. Wolverton 6 M | D. A. Masters 1 E | Stewart H. White 1‡ | |
| Port Arthur, Tex. | H. F. Baker 3 A | D. P. Rachal 1 A | H. H. Poole† | Robert L. Cooper 3 C | |
| Port Chester, N. Y. | A. Leo Brogan 3 C | Eric Jensen*‡ | George A. Mowbray 3 C | A. T. Clark | William G. Reardon 2 C p |
| Port Huron, Mich. | Charles Scheffler 2 C | Frank Schaller 20 C | Charles D. Rettie 8 E | Albert Wiegand 2 C | Robert T. Edwards 1 E p |
| Port Jervis, N. Y. | Edward V. Moorehead 17 C | Howard Wheat 25‡ | Reuben S. Dimock 1 C† | Horace A. Sheldon 4 C | |
| Portland, Me. | Ralph D. Brooks 3 A | Oliver T. Sanborn 10 A | Edward M. Hunt 19 A | Fred J. Reny | William J. Dougherty 15 B p |
| Portland, Ore. | Harry M. Niles* M | Edward Grenfell 7 C | Ormond R. Bean 2 E | L. S. Kaiser 20 C | C. P. Keyser 17‡ p |
| Portsmouth, N. H. | George H. Ducker 11 B | William F. Woods 21 C | Harold Woods* B† | Harold Woods* B | Harold Woods* B p |
| Portsmouth, Ohio | Harry Sheets A | Robert Leedom A | George Yates† | F. E. Sheehan A | |
| Portsmouth, Va. | James Talbot 3 A | R. A. Alexander 20 A | M. E. Haug† | W. L. Davis 16 A | |
| Pottstown, Pa. | Barclay B. Scheetz 10 C | John M. Bossert 1 C | I. W. Foreman† | Frank Seasholtz | W. O. Cressman rs |
| Pottsville, Pa. | Claude A. Lord 1 E | George A. Smith 4‡ | David Thomas† | N. J. Clayton | Aaron Moore*‡ p |
| Poughkeepsie, N. Y. | George Leadbitter 2 B | Chris J. Noll 7 C | Walter J. Diesing 2 M | Walter E. Walker B | Frank Berry B p |
| Providence, R. I. | Miles A. Glidden*‡ | Frank Charlesworth 4‡ | Charles A. Maguire 2 C | Charles A. Maguire | Ernest K. Thomas 6 B p |
| Provo, Utah | John H. Harris 2 M | Clyde Scott 5 M | James E. Snyder 4 E | Clark Newell 8 B | W. M. Andrew 4 B p |
| Pueblo, Colo. | J. A. Grady‡ | L. P. Willis‡ | H. E. MacFarlane† | D. P. Porter | R. H. Talbot 6 E p |
| Quincy, Ill. | J. R. Connery 2 M | George Simon 2 M | H. Middendorf 2 M | W. R. Gelston 28 B | Henry Juette 1 B p |
| Quincy, Mass. | Ernest H. Bishop 8 M | William J. Sands 4 M | Angelo P. Bizzozero 2 M | John J. Whitman | |
| Racine, Wis. | Grover C. Lutter 4 M | Thomas R. Hartnett 2 M | Henry A. Nelson 10 M | Walter A. Peirce 7 B | I. F. Farmer 17 B p |
| Rahway, N. J. | George McIntyre 5 C | Walter Ritzman 5 C | Arnold D'Ambrosa† | Walter Ludlow 10 B | |
| Raleigh, N. C. | C. B. Barbour 4‡ | W. E. Holland 12‡ | Ed. M. Barton 2 E | W. H. Newell 1‡ | W. A. Howell 47‡ p |
| Rapid City, S. D. | Len Rogers 1 C | George Scheidt 7 C | E. M. Sneckenberger† | E. M. Sneckenberger 4 C | E. M. Sneckenberger 4 C p |
| Reading, Pa. | John S. Giles 3 C | Harry J. Brown 3 C | F. A. Muhlenberg 3 E | A. R. O'Reilly 11 C | William I. Hoch 20 C p |
| Red Bank, N. J. | Harry H. Clayton 22 M | Joseph Fix 1‡ | Robert Pierce† | R. C. Hackstaff 1 M | |
| Redlands, Calif. | Walter L. Thomas 11 C | Perrin G. Trowbridge 6 C | George S. Hinckley† | George S. Hinckley 22 C | W. T. Ferguson 5 C p |
| Reno, Nev. | J. M. Kirkley M | Lee Kawcroft M | James M. Glynn† | George Campbell | Henry Dietrich M p |
| Rensselaer, N. Y. | M. Lawrence Moulds 9‡ | John Secor 1 B | Frank Groark 1 M† | Charles Claflin | William Adams 12 M r |
| Revere, Mass. | Edward J. Tighe 8 M | Thomas J. McCarrick 8 M | Walter A. Sancris* M | James A. Lockhart | |

## TABLE VIII-C.—DIRECTORY OF CITY OFFICIALS IN ALL CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued

| City | Police Chief | Fire Chief | Director of Public Works | Water Works Superintendent | Parks and Recreation Director |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Richmond, Calif. | L. E. Jones 2 A | W. P. Cooper 11 A | Edward A. Hoffman† | John S. Longwell | R. Tcherassy 11 A p |
| Richmond, Ind. | Henry Vogelsong* M | Harry E. Williams M | John V. Schneider† | Howard Dill | |
| Richmond, Va. | R. B. Jordan 10‡ | W. H. Joynes 10‡ | Albert D. Burkhardt* M† | George H. Whitfield 10 M | R. Keith Compton 10 M p r |
| Ridgefield Park, N. J. | F. A. Larson‡ | Louis Latzko 1‡ | Edwin S. Ferris 11 E | Nicholas S. Hill, Jr. | |
| Ridgewood, N. J. | R. Floyd Tremper 3 C | Arthur DeMouth 2 C | Frank D. Leverimore 4 E | J. Arthur Carr 13 C | Henry Lenning 18 C p |
| River Rouge, Mich. | Thomas Verellen 1 M | Edward Bodary 10 M | A. M. Gatien 2 M | A. M. Gatien 2 M | A. M. Gatien 2 M p |
| Riverside, Calif. | Halbert B. Heastan 2 M | Ed. Mosbaugh 5 M | James R. Elliott 2 M† | Robert L. Boulden 2 B | J. C. Cooper 4 B p |
| Roanoke, Va. | C. E. Heckman* A | W. M. Mullins 5 A | | Charles E. Moore | K. M. Cowan 5 A r |
| Rochester, Minn. | Louis J. Claude 3‡ | C. E. Ginther 5‡ | | Eugene F. Schwarz 13 B | Ralph B. Compton 14 B p |
| Rochester, N. H. | Fred S. Hartford 2 C | John F. Nute 20 C | Harry F. Howard 3 C† | George D. Dame 9 C | Albert Bickford rs |
| Rochester, N. Y. | Henry T. Copenhagen 1‡ | Morris Keating 1‡ | Thomas J. Morrison 1 A | Meloy J. Smith 1‡ | Patrick Slavin 6‡ p |
| Rockford, Ill. | A. E. Bargren 43 B | Thomas D. Blake 12 B | Raymond A. Orput† | Mogens Ipsen 1 M | Mr. Elliott p |
| Rock Hill, S. C. | B. R. Ross 1 C | T. O. Flowers 25 C | J. E. Oates† | J. M. Garrison 16 A | |
| Rock Island, Ill. | Herman Sehnert 30 B | August Schmidt 32 B | William F. Evans† | N. J. Hoeltzner 28 M | J. G. Evans B p |
| Rockville Centre, N. Y. | Horace L. Allen 4 | Harry W. Lister 2‡ | Joseph F. Russ† | H. C. Major 21 B | Floyd B. Bower rs |
| Rocky Mount, N. C. | O. P. Hedgepeth 25 A | J. R. Sorsby 10 A | A. S. Lyon 4 A | George P. Womble 5 A | N. C. Pitt 10 A p |
| Rome, Ga. | H. B. Gordon 2 A | C. B. Bradford 2 A | T. E. Booz 2 A | Sam Frye 20 A | O. M. Lanham 2 C |
| Rome, N. Y. | Joseph T. Owens 10 B | Harry W. Piggott 2 B | S. E. Townsend, Jr. 1 M | C. E. Rosenburgh 6‡ | Charles W. Havens rs |
| Roselle, N. J. | Burt M. Avery 14 M | George S. Wright 3 M | Edward S. Hagerthy 1 M | Edward S. Hagerthy | |
| Roswell, N. Mex. | Frank Young 4 M | Rue Chrisman 7 M | C. D. Fulton† | Lea Rowland 4 M | C. D. Fulton 15 M p |
| Royal Oak, Mich. | Alfred Reynolds 12 A | Charles Henning 15 A | M. W. Harris 10 A | George F. Landgraf 8 A | M. W. Harris 10 A p |
| Rutherford, N. J. | Charles Rosenfelder | Andrew DeGroot* E | F. Hackenburg 15 M | Nicholas S. Hill, Jr. | Gerald Tamblyn rs |
| Rutland, Vt. | Roy H. Leonard 10 M | A. H. Koltenski 11 M | Edward L. Tracy 3 M | E. L. Beardsley 8 M | Edward L. Tracy 3 M p |
| Sacramento, Calif. | W. M. Hallahan 5 A | M. J. Dunphy 14 A | Charles R. Blood† | R. E. Mittelstaedt 4 A | F. N. Evans 17 A p |
| Saginaw, Mich. | Fred Genske C | Frank Bender, Jr. C | George Holcomb 4 E | Alfred Eckert C | Edward Oscar E p |
| St. Augustine, Fla. | William Lindsey 1 A | William Parkhill 1 A | Eugene Masters 3 C | John L. Center 15 A | Anton Burger 8 A p |
| St. Charles, Mo. | Arthur C. Smith 4 E | F. B. Feuerstein 9 M | Walter Hueffmeyer 2 C | H. H. Kansteiner 2 B | W. T. Sparenberg 7 C p |
| St. Cloud, Minn. | Edward J. Brick 1 C | John J. Gillis 7 C | Nat B. Fish 3 E | R. E. Borrowman 2 C | Joseph Munsinger 7 C p |
| St. Joseph, Mo. | C. A. Enos 2 B | Leo Urbanski 8 M | J. G. Jones 4 M | Jesse T. Bodkin | W. L. Skolund 15 B p |
| St. Louis, Mo. | John J. McCarthy 2 B | John J. O'Boyle 2 M | Baxter L. Brown 2 M | C. M. Daily 2 M | William A. Miller 2 M p |
| St. Paul, Minn. | M. J. Culligan 1‡ | W. J. Sudeith 1‡ | Milton Rosen 5 E | L. N. Thompson 8 B | W. L. Kaufman 3‡ p |
| St. Petersburg, Fla. | R. H. Noel 5 C | John T. McNulty 22 C | C. F. Sharpe 1 C | Frank O. Lee 3 A | A. C. Beers 6 B p |
| Salem, Mass. | John C. Harkins 3 M | Joseph H. Flynn 1 M | Patrick J. Kelly 29 M | Frank P. Morse 7 M | Daniel J. Phelan 3 B p |
| Salem, Ohio | Ralph Stouffer 2‡ | V. L. Malloy 22‡ | Charles J. Kennedy 2 M | Charles J. Kennedy 2 M | F. L. Rollins 29 B p |
| Salem, Ore. | Frank A. Minto‡ | Harry Hutton‡ | | | R. R. Boardman rs |
| Salina, Kans. | D. K. Fitch 8 A | Ben Wolbert 8 A | L. M. Srack† | H. L. Brown 9 C | T. R. Ricklefs 3 A p |
| Salinas, Calif. | G. W. Griffin 4 C | George VonSoosten 10 C | Donald Davies, Jr.† | T. W. Snell | Donald Davies, Jr. 4 C p |
| Salisbury, Md. | N. H. Holland 4 M | Austin Moore 1 M | | Clark Gardiner 2 M | H. Milton Hearne rs |
| Salisbury, N. C. | R. L. Rankin 8 C | W. A. Brown 20 C | J. A. Weant† | J. A. English 2 C | |
| Salt Lake City, Utah | W. L. Payne 3‡ | W. S. Knight 10‡ | P. S. Condie† | H . K. Burton 20‡ | George Wilson 1‡ p |
| San Angelo, Tex. | Sam Haynes 5 A | John Parker 32 A | T. Frank Bell† | W. E. Beaty | A. N. Carlin B p |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| San Antonio, Tex. | O. W. Kilday 7 B | J. G. Sarran 11 B | P. E. Steffler† | W. D. Masterson 9 B | Henry Steingruber 4 B p |
| San Benito, Tex. | F. S. Cowart 1 M | C. L. Potter 5 M | E. J. Preston† | S. C. Clark | A. L. Price C p |
| San Bernardino, Calif. | Dan G. Murdock 2 M | H. A. Purden, Sr.* M | Gordon Stewart† | Bard Livingstone 2‡ | Gordon Stewart 2 M p |
| San Diego, Calif. | George M. Sears 1 A | Louis Almgren 26 A | F. A. Rhodes 2 A | F. A. Rhodes 2 A | John G. Morley 23 A p |
| Sandusky, Ohio | C. A. Weingates 36 A | John Curtis 16 A | Robert L. J. Wagar 1 C | Charles Gremelsbacher 20 A | Jake Roth 35 A p |
| Sanford, Fla. | R. G. Williams 12 C | M. N. Cleveland 10 C | James Moughton† | John Abrahams 10 C | James Moughton 7 C p |
| San Francisco, Calif. | W. J. Quinn 6 B | Charles F. Brennan 6 B | W. H. Worden 3‡ | N. A. Eckart 5‡ | John McLaren 47 B p |
| San Jose, Calif. | J. N. Black 18 A | Charles A. Plummer 8 A | W. L. Popp† | H. S. Kittredge | W. L. Popp 14 A p |
| San Leandro, Calif. | J. F. Peralta A | L. R. Martin A | A. E. Pelton† | John S. Longwell | A. E. Pelton C p |
| San Mateo, Calif. | T. M. Burke 16 A | H. F. Morris 9 A | E. P. Wilsey† | C. B. Jackson | T. T. Pearson 8 A p |
| Santa Ana, Calif. | Floyd W. Howard 4 E | J. Luxembourger 17 C | J. L. McBride 2 C | J. L. McBride 2 C | J. L. McBride 2 C p |
| Santa Barbara, Calif. | Jess A. Butts 1 B | F. W. Stronach 2 B | E. B. Brown† | V. E. Trace 30 M | John H. Hartfeld 5 M p |
| Santa Cruz, Calif. | Al Huntsman 2 C | R. S. Tait 30 C | R. W. Fowler† | R. S. Tait 26 C | |
| Santa Fe, N. Mex. | T. P. Delgado 2 C | Herbert Mendenhall | Lucas C. Sena† | O. B. Summers | |
| Santa Monica, Calif. | C. E. Webb 19 M | William J. Mohr 22 M | H. C. Sanborn 1 E | H. C. Sanborn 1 E | H. C. Sanborn 1 E p |
| Santa Rosa, Calif. | Charles B. O'Neal 10 A | William Muenter 6 A | Arthur P. Noyes† | Arthur P. Noyes 10 A | Fred C. Steiner 2 M p |
| Sapulpa, Okla. | J. O. Edwards 1 A | W. M. Collier 15 A | J. E. Rhodes† | H. D. Pickett 3 A | George Gleason 4 A p |
| Saratoga Springs, N. Y. | P. Rox 3‡ | J. Hickey 3‡ | G. W. Ainsworth 6 E | F. Cherry 12‡ | |
| Saugus, Mass. | John Stuart | Mellen Joy | Dexter Pratt | Dexter Pratt | |
| Sault Ste. Marie, Mich. | Matt Mitchell 1 A | F. F. Trombley 13 A | Henry A. Sherman 15 C | Henry A. Sherman 15 C | Henry A. Sherman 15 C p |
| Savannah, Ga. | J. J. Clancy 2 M | W. S. Blanton 2 M | R. H. Clements 10 M | L. A. East 10 M | William H. Robertson 36 B p |
| Schenectady, N. Y. | William H. Funston 10 M | August G. Derra 11 M | Walter S. Wood 1 M | Walter D. Przybylek 1‡ | W. S. Wood 1 M pr |
| Scranton, Pa. | Harry Davis 1 M | John J. Kelly* M | William A. Schunk 7 M | Homer F. Cox | Herman M. Kerber 13 M p |
| Seattle, Wash. | Walter B. Kirtley* M | Claude W. Corning 4 M | Thomas R. Beeman 1 M† | Harold D. Fowler 1 M | Harry M. Westfall 1 M p |
| Sedalia, Mo. | W. L. Marlin 1 E | W. H. Paul* M | J. J. Love† | L. P. Andrews | |
| Selma, Ala. | N. S. Stanfill 12 C | W. L. Pitts 4 C | R. S. Browning† | Robert Coleman 15 B | |
| Seminole, Okla. | Jake Sims | B. E. Brodnax | R. D. Wright† | John Molitor | |
| Shaker Hgts., Ohio | Bert H. Tilson* M | Merle M. Hand* M | W. E. Arnold 4 M | | Howard G. Moritz rs |
| Shamokin, Pa. | Aaron Jones | James Glennon C | Leon C. Adams† | D. E. McWilliams | |
| Sharon, Pa. | Charles B. Steger 12 C | Leroy Hall 1 C | Ray Stewart† | A. R. Girdwood | J. B. Goldberg 3 E p |
| Shawnee, Okla. | F. A. Budd 15 A | W. W. Wicker 15 A | M. Nelson† | E. L. Moon 20 A | E. F. Redwine 3 A p |
| Sheboygan, Wis. | Walter H. Wagner 7 B | Charles W. Brandt 6 B | Fred Hensel 4 M | Arthur H. Miller 4 B | C. C. Buenger 6 B p |
| Shelby, N. C. | D. D. Wilkins 2 C | J. R. Robinson 6 C | E. W. Spangler† | R. V. Toms 16 C | |
| Shelbyville, Ind. | Earl Trees* M | William Briggs 15 M | Augustus Minster† | H. G. Sherritt | |
| Shelton, Conn. | William S. Donovan 15 | Frederick W. Cotter 1 C | Joseph Stewart M† | Frederick W. Cotter | George W. Anger rs |
| Shenandoah, Pa. | Joseph Gorney | Ralph Miller | George Mozdyniewicz† | John Hobbs | |
| Sherman, Tex. | H. Grady Thompson 3 A | Jones Andrews 20 A | W. Morgan Works 3 C | George Stephens 20 A | Bob Harrison 15 A p |
| Shorewood, Wis. | Emil F. Bartels 7 A | Emil F. Bartels 7 A | John G. Deppisch 11 A† | Rud. Tretow 22 A | William D. Stockwell 7 A p |
| Shreveport, La. | E. E. Norvell 1 C | S. J. Flores 15 C | R. L. Pyle† | T. L. Amiss 20 C | Y. L. Blackwell 1 M p |
| Sioux City, Iowa | John McKenna 1‡ | George M. Kellogg 45 | William Hansen† | Phil Carlin 44 C | H. C. Kingsbury 1 C p |
| Sioux Falls, S. D. | John Rooks 1 M | William A. Sloan 23 M | Ellis O. Smith 13 E | Joseph S. Nelson 9 E | J. H. Fitzgerald 1 B p |
| Somerville, Mass. | Thomas Damery 5 M | John C. McNally 2 | William J. Sullivan 1 M | Joseph P. Phillips 1 M | Francis J. Mahoney 5 B r |
| South Bend, Ind. | Laurence J. Lane 4 M | William F. Freeh 4 M | Fred G. Anderson 4 M | L. G. Bradford 4 M | William Walker‡ p |
| Southbridge, Mass. | Ulric Brault | Joseph E. Duchesneau | A. Laporte† | G. H. Abbott | |
| South Gate, Calif. | Willard D. Bretz 1 C | David F. Glines C | Carle E. Holden 1 E | L. M. Rothkranz 10 C | |
| South Milwaukee, Wis. | Frank Briesemeister B | J. O'Connell B | Henry Wink† | J. Stosick C | Marie Killingstad rs |
| South Orange, N. J. | Patrick J. Maguire 12 | John C. Loughran 1 | T. F. Fitzsimmons† | C. P. Nolan 30 | Joseph Farrell 5 r |
| South Pasadena, Calif. | Frank B. Higgins 19 C | J. F. Smith 15 C | Glen Garwood† | John C. James 20 | Glen Garwood 7 C p |

## Table VIII-C.—Directory of City Officials in all Cities Over 10,000—Continued

| City | Police Chief | Fire Chief | Director of Public Works | Water Works Superintendent | Parks and Recreation Director |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| South Portland, Me. | Charles O. Spear, Jr. A | Charles O. Spear, Jr. A | Albert W. Waterman A | Fred J. Reny | |
| South River, N. J. | Charles Eberwein 20 M | Arthur Eppinger 1‡ | R. D. Boorwin 1 M | E. B. VanNess 12 B | |
| South St. Paul, Minn. | E. J. McAlpine 2 B | Harry Rund 2 B | Joseph Lenertz, Sr. 2 M | W. H. Cropsey 2 C | Henry Myers 2 M p |
| Spartanburg, S. C. | Geddes E. West 2 C | C. S. Warlick 3 C | R. B. Simms 12 B | R. B. Simms 12 B | J. D. Deason 16 C p |
| Spokane, Wash. | Ira A. Martin 2 C | William Payne 2 C | Leonard Fund 19 E | Alex Lindsay 23‡ | John W. Duncan 25 B p |
| Springfield, Ill. | Carl F. Nuess 4 M | William H. Funderburk 8‡ | Willis J. Spaulding 24 E | Charles H. Spaulding 16‡ | George Luers 12 B p |
| Springfield, Mass. | John L. Maloney 3 B | Herbert C. Root 2 B | Cornelius W. Phillips 2 C | Howard M. King 13 B | Theodore R. Geisel 5 B p |
| Springfield, Mo. | P. A. Frey 3 M | W. R. Price 18 M | Harry E. Bartlett 1 E | W. H. Dewey | T. A. Nicholson 3 B p |
| Springfield, Ohio | George Abele A | Grover L. Frock* A | Frank Way† | Robert E. Price 1 A | S. L. Fisher 6 B p |
| Stamford, Conn. | John T. Brennan 15 B | Victor Veit 14 B | Joseph Deenihan† | B. H. Keeler | Alfred A. Volante 1‡ p |
| Statesville, N. C. | W. S. Thomas 2 C | B. M. Garrison 2 C | R. L. Crawley 2 C | R. L. Crawley 2 C | |
| Staunton, Va. | W. P. Davis 25 A | E. H. Dabney 7 A | J. C. Ruff 1 C | E. H. Dabney 2 A | (Vacant) |
| Steelton, Pa. | Paul F. Reisch 10 C | James F. Thompson 8 C | Claude W. Baskins† | Claude W. Baskins 8 C | C. S. Davis 12 C p |
| Sterling, Ill. | Curtis Bucher 8‡ | Connel Nicol 10‡ | F. M. Stager 4 E† | Emmet MacDonald | G. S. Olmstead 4 E p |
| Steubenville, Ohio | Ross H. Cunningham 8 M | Edward J. Green 23 M | William A. Hamilton 3 M | J. N. Carter 11 M | R. McClintock 1 B pr |
| Stevens Point, Wis. | Leo Frymark 7 A | F. F. Kirsling 2 A | Peter Walraven 5 C | C. E. VanHecke 11 B | Emery W. Sively 2 A p |
| Stockton, Calif. | Frank H. Fredericks 3 A | M. D. Murphy 23 A | Al. H. Chevesich† | F. W. Jones | Victor G. Anderson 10 A p |
| Stoneham, Mass. | J. Clarence Nelson 3 C | William F. McCall 8 C | Cornelius J. Sweeney 8 C | Cornelius J. Sweeney | Percival H. Wardwell 1 B p |
| Stratford, Conn. | William B. Nichols 16 A | Allen B. Judson 16 A | Daniel McLeod 6 A | Dwight Hall | Daniel McLeod 6 A p |
| Streator, Ill. | Harry Reynolds 2 B | Frank A. Owens 34 B | J. E. Hall 8 E† | R. D. Huggans | M. H. Reed 4 E p |
| Struthers, Ohio | Harry Davis 4‡ | M. J. Dittmar 10 M | Jules Richards 3 M | G. Taylor Evans | Charles Mohr 5 M pr |
| Suffolk, Va. | Henly W. Churn 8 A | J. H. Bangley 3 A | W. J. Bayett† | | |
| Summit, N. J. | Ed. T. Nelson* M | Thomas White* C | William H. Swain† | William F. McMane | H. S. Kennedy 1 B r |
| Sumter, S. C. | A. D. Owens 6 C | R. E. Wilder 16 C | C. B. Huggins† | F. K. Ellis 10 C | Mrs. J. L. Dillon 10 C p |
| Sunbury, Pa. | Michael Sergent 5 C | C. S. Oplinger 1 C | Morris R. Michaels 1 E | William Rohrbach | G. B. Reichley 1 E p |
| Superior, Wis. | Arthur Buchanan 13 M | James T. Sweeney 1 M | Fred C. Tomlinson† | George A. Corine | Quentin Ferm* M r |
| Swampscott, Mass. | Walter F. Reeves 10 C | James Warnock 15‡ | Michael J. Ryan† | John M. Mather 21 B | |
| Sweetwater, Tex. | N. B. Hall 5 A | A. C. Forgay 1 A | Roy Duckett 7 A | Roy Duckett 7 A | Roy Duckett 7 A p |
| Swissvale, Pa. | R. W. Stitt 1 C | P. J. McGurk 20 C | Allen F. Koch 3 C | | |
| Syracuse, N. Y. | Thomas Carroll* M | Edward W. Gieselman 5‡ | George H. Ballantyne 9 M | William W. Cronin 6 M | William A. Barry 5 M p |
| Tacoma, Wash. | H. L. Bird 1‡ | E. N. Whitaker 3‡ | A. R. Bergersen 3‡ | W. A. Kunigk 17‡ | H. S. Daten 1‡ p |
| Tallahassee, Fla. | Gid Powledge 8 A | T. P. Coe 23 A | T. K. Prevette† | R. M. Temple 17 A | George D. Stout 5 A p |
| Tamaqua, Pa. | Nelson Hughes 7 C | F. B. Behr 9 C | John Maine† | G. I. Knies 6 B | W. Welsh 1 B r |
| Tampa, Fla. | R. G. Tittsworth 1 M | Alonzo J. White M | Roy H. Cason† | John S. Long 2 M | Marco M. Penn 3 M p |
| Taunton, Mass. | John P. Duffy 2 M | Edward F. Gorey 4 C | Jeremiah F. Foley† | Arthur King E | Louis O. Godfrey B p |
| Taylor, Pa. | James Morris 6 C | William James 2 C | John J. Ott† | C. W. Morris | John J. Ott 4 C p |
| Temple, Tex. | B. G. Duncan 1 C | George Hoherd 13 C | | W. G. Gardenhire 1 C | |
| Terre Haute, Ind. | Lewis Wheeler 8‡ | Albert W. Rowe 1‡ | Robert W. Paige 1 | W. H. Durbin | B. VanBorssum 1‡ p |
| Texarkana, Ark. | W. E. Davis M | W. J. Springer M | W. Cornelias† | J. G. Wood | |
| Texarkana, Tex. | J. N. Runnels 2 E | J. E. Benjamin 1 C | A. D. Lanier† | J. G. Wood | A. C. Stuart 4 C p |
| Thomasville, Ga. | J. M. Hancock 2 E | J. E. Porter 12 C | N. W. Crawford† | D. R. Pringle 20 C | Tom Dollar 2 C p |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tiffin, Ohio | Charles J. Mutchler M | John A. Grogg M | Mark T. Wertz M | C. H. Wetter | |
| Toledo, Ohio | D. T. Wolfe 1 M | Fred J. Myers 10 M | G. N. Schoonmaker 1 M | Pratt W. Egbert 1 M | Gordon Jeffrey* M r |
| Tonawanda, N. Y. | George C. Marohn 6 C | Grover C. Rech 16 C | Harvey Bluckhorn 4 C | Frank E. Chase | |
| Topeka, Kans. | M. J. Leonard 2 M | William J. Cawker 2 M | William E. Howe 2 E† | H. H. Huffman 5‡ | George Hornbeck 1‡ p |
| Torrington, Conn. | Hugh E. Meade‡ | John A. Palmer‡ | Ernest E. Novey 6 E | William E. French | Ernest E. Novey 6 E p |
| Traverse City, Mich. | John M. Blacken 16 C | J. Fifarek 7 C | C. H. Foster 41 E | W. S. Williams 20 C | C. H. Foster 41 E p |
| Trenton, N. J. | William Walter 10‡ | John G. Ford 5‡ | Abram Swan, Jr. 10 E | Alvin Bugbee 25‡ | Herbert Bradley 1 C p |
| Trinidad, Colo. | Mike Foudy 2‡ | David J. Thompson 2‡ | J. J. Cox† | Hal Barnes 2‡ | Tillman Cook 2‡ p |
| Troy, N. Y. | John B. Conroy 3‡ | Cornelius Casey 16‡ | Alfred E. Roche 7 M | William J. Luby 8 M | P. H. Draper 9‡ |
| Tucson, Ariz. | C. A. Wollard 2 M | Joseph A. Roberts 14 M | George W. Seeley† | Phil J. Martin, Jr. 4 A | George W. Seeley 4 A p |
| Tulsa, Okla. | Charles F. Carr M | R. W. Granger M | Ben O. Angel E† | W. F. Anderson M | Will O. Doolittle B p |
| Turtle Creek, Pa. | William J. Whalen | F. W. Bethune | J. F. Duncan | | |
| Tuscaloosa, Ala. | H. D. Billingsley 4 C | E. L. Mathews 4 C | Luther Davis 12 E | C. S. Read 4 C | A. C. Parker 4 C p |
| Two Rivers, Wis. | John Rebman 1 A | A. J. Rahn 8 A | Ernst Sonntag† | Paul E. Capraro 12 A | Leonard Birr 2 A p |
| Tyler, Tex. | J. J. Ray 6 A | M. P. Burns 13 A | J. P. Ferrill 10 A | Jesse Shaw A | Lee H. Powell 9 C p |
| | | | | | |
| Union City, N. J. | Charles Dillman 2‡ | Charles Friedel, Jr. 5‡ | Fred Holtje, Jr. 2 E | Nicholas S. Hill, Jr. | |
| Uniontown, Pa. | D. F. McDonald 10 C | W. H. Barclay 3 C | P. D. Coates† | Ira W. Seaton 20‡ | J. C. Reisinger 2 E p |
| University City, Mo. | George Ward 10 M | Michael Lyons 2 M | J. J. Leahy 2 M† | William B. Henby | James K. Monteith 5 B p r |
| Urbana, Ill. | George Leming* M | John Hays 2 M | G. B. Jenkins* M | Frank C. Amsbary, Jr. 7 | W. H. Grant 26 B p |
| Utica, N. Y. | T. D. McCarthy 14‡ | Joseph N. Sullivan 10‡ | T. Edward McDermott 1‡ | J. S. M. Wharton | James Mellen 1‡ p |
| | | | | | |
| Valdosta, Ga. | W. P. Kendall 16 M | T. M. Cook, Jr. 18 M | Charles A. Dunbar† | Charles A. Dunbar 3 M | R. J. Drexel 8 M p |
| Vallejo, Calif. | William T. Stanford 35 C | D. J. Noonan 16 C | Frank Brew 10 E | T. D. Kilkenny 20 C | T. D. Kilkenny 20 C p |
| Valley Stream, N. Y. | James Wheelwright | Vendel Schneider‡ | J. Groenewold M | | |
| Vancouver, Wash. | F. B. Osmond* M | Fred Day* M | George Bernash† | Rex R. Osburn | |
| Vandergrift, Pa. | D. L. Johnston 8 C | E. K. Kinkead 6‡ | L. L. Leighty† | Parker R. Neff | E. K. Kinkead 3 C p |
| Ventura, Calif. | T. W. Neel 3 A | H. A. Johnson 36 A | D. C. McMillan* C | C. F. Zapf 3 A | Austin B. Perley 1 A p |
| Vicksburg, Miss. | W. L. Tucker 15 B | W. H. Fuller 7 B | J. M. Buchanan† | P. A. Tvargosky 9 | F. H. Andrews 6 p |
| Vincennes, Ind. | Thomas M. Martin 5 M | J. Edmund Burway 3 M | Robert E. Lind 5 M | M. H. Schwartz | William C. Rayls 3 M p |
| Virginia, Minn. | Charles Gronberg 1‡ | Nels Quist 12‡ | Major Smith† | M. S. Bright 8‡ | A. F. Thayer 12‡ p |
| | | | | | |
| Waco, Tex. | Woodie Zachry 1 C | J. R. Meers 18 C | J. H. Strange† | George J. Rohan 3 B | B. G. Kendall 20 B p |
| Wakefield, Mass. | James J. Pollard 26 C | Fred D. Graham 14 C | Harry H. Denning† | Morrison Merrill 18 B | William D. Healey 5 B r |
| Walla Walla, Wash. | Fred Roff 2 C | William Davis 1 C | Robert Carey† | R. F. McLean 25 C | Robert Carey C p |
| Wallingford, Conn. | George C. Abbott 15 M | J. J. Luby 15 M | William A. MacKenzie 25 M | William A. MacKenzie 25 M | William Coyle 3 M r |
| Waltham, Mass. | Richard Currin 9 M | George L. Johnson 29 M | Henry F. Beal 5 M | Henry F. Beal | Lowell Warren 2 M p |
| Warren, Ohio | Barney J. Gillen 15 M | Edwin H. Oldacres 5‡ | D. B. Gutelius 1 M | C. E. Inman 14‡ | Gould Stewart 5 M p |
| Warren, Pa. | G. F. Haehn | D. G. Kropf 2 C | Marcus Larsen† | J. J. Mitchell | Philip Cerra p |
| Warwick, R. I. | Henry J. Ledoux | | John A. O'Brien* M | (Vacant) | |
| Washington, D. C. | Ernest W. Brown 2 | Charles E. Schrom 1 | J. B. Gordon | D. W. Holton 5 | Clifford Lanham 18 p |
| Washington, Pa. | Joseph Verderber | A. L. Loar | C. A. Shrontz† | D. C. Morrow | Dorothy Wise rs |
| Waterbury, Conn. | Joseph McLean 9 B | Thomas Lynch* B | Thomas Fleming 3 B† | Thomas Fleming 3 B | Irving Harrison 12 B p |
| Waterloo, Iowa | Hugh Crumrine 1 M | Ray Tiller 14‡ | N. B. Barber† | George E. Shoemaker 24 B | C. C. Chesterman 14 B p |
| Watertown, Mass. | J. F. Milmore 17 C | J. W. O'Hearn 22 C | Pierce P. Condon† | W. E. Rundlett 16 B | A. D. Mosmann 8 B p |
| Watertown, N. Y. | E. J. Singleton 22 A | W. E. Gaffney 15 A | C. M. Getman 30 A | H. J. Haley 8 A | C. M. Getman 30 A p |
| Watertown, S. D. | L. P. Johnson 4 M | O. B. Kinsman 4 M | Ralph Reed 2 M† | E. H. Schulz | A. C. Nelson 19 M p |

TABLE VIII-C.—DIRECTORY OF CITY OFFICIALS IN ALL CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued.

| City | Police Chief | Fire Chief | Director of Public Works | Water Works Superintendent | Parks and Recreation Director |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Watertown, Wis. | Albert N. Quest 3 B | Robert Kerstell 1 B | P. A. Glaser 4 C | H. G. Reichardt 5 B | Ewald Brumm 9 B p |
| Waterville, Me. | Alfred Poirier‡ | Grover D. Lovejoy | E. Payson Witham† | O. H. Thompson | A. F. Cyr C p |
| Watervliet, N. Y. | Maurice J. Kennan 5 M | James J. Corbett 10 M | Frank T. Mahar 2 M | Frank T. Mahar 2 M | Frank T. Mahar 2 M p |
| Waukegan, Ill. | William Blaylock 1 M | S. O. Farrell 4 M | August Shinsky† | James Wright 4 M | Al. Grosche rs |
| Waukesha, Wis. | Bernard Enders 16 B | Peter Wild 31 B | W. E. Dick 1 M | Arthur P. Kuranz 5 B | Steve Prelozni 1 B p |
| Wausau, Wis. | Thomas Malone 34 B | Arthur Buss 3 B | R. H. Hoenisch† | Emil Flatter 9 B | I. S. Horgen 8 B p |
| Wauwatosa, Wis. | Harry Ridenour 2 M | J. C. Lefeber, Jr. 20 M | John Krafczyk† | A. W. Hebbring | John Iverson M p |
| Waycross, Ga. | H. C. Thackston 20 C | H. C. Thackston 20 C | John L. Youmans† | H. M. Pafford 1 C | James Fulford 10 B p |
| Waynesboro, Pa. | S. W. Staley 3 C | C. E. Shoemaker 1 C | Roy Robinson† | Roy Robinson 5 C | |
| Webster, Mass. | John C. Templeman 2 C | Arthur Belmore 10 C | Henry Lucier 2 B† | Samuel G. Wylie 12 B | Arthur Bigelow 10 E p |
| Webster Groves, Mo. | Andrew McDonnell 10 C | J. Ralph Eddie 18 C | Bert Forester† | Frank C. Zuroweste 14 C | T. H. Heath 4 E p |
| Wellesley, Mass. | William J. Fleming 15‡ | Thomas H. Slaman 10‡ | William A. Burnett† | W. G. MacFadyen 20 C | George L. Abell 12 B p |
| Wenatchee, Wash. | Carl Hansen 1 M | H. W. Bryson 3 M | Lester L. Gellatly 1 E | Harry Issler 1‡ | |
| West Allis, Wis. | T. Kastello 1 B | E. Bryant 4 B | A. L. Wichner 9 C | R. Singer 11 C | E. C. Pynn 8 B p |
| Westbrook, Me. | Edward A. Reny* M | Edward A. Reny 3 M | Charles E. Curtis 8 M | Fred J. Reny | E. J. Laverty 12 M p |
| West Chester, Pa. | E. P. Darlington 2 | George J. Moses | Lawrence Reagan† | Charles L. Leedon 2‡ | |
| Westerly, R. I. | Robert Kessel* C | Columbus Pasetti 2 E | James Hamilton† | Arthur H. Coy 5 B | |
| Westfield, Mass. | Thomas F. Daley 12 | Thomas H. Mahoney 24‡ | Oren E. Parks 14 B | Oren E. Parks 14 B | Elizabeth B. Fowler 1 M p |
| Westfield, N. J. | J. C. Rosecrans | Fred C. Decker | George B. Miller† | George M. Haskew | |
| West Frankfort, Ill. | G. Nipper M | Thad Fife M | | Alvin Misker | |
| West Hartford, Conn. | Joseph F. Grogan 10 B | | Rodney L. Loomis 1 C | | Robert Parsons, Jr. rs |
| West Haven, Conn. | Harry Tuttle | Lloyd Cameron | Bernard A. Mehls, Jr. 1 C | Bernard Mehls, Jr. | Walter Scranton B p |
| West New York, N. J. | Charles Hangley 15 | Ernest G. Beckert 21 | Charles Daume 4 E | Nicholas S. Hill, Jr. | |
| West Orange, N. J. | P. J. McDonough 17 | M. T. Kennedy 9 | F. A. O'Connor 40 E | P. H. Glannan | William Huligan 5‡ r |
| West Palm Beach, Fla. | Robert W. Milburn 3 E | A. P. Sadler 22 A | D. D. Howard 9 A | R. W. Reynolds | D. D. Howard 9 A p |
| West Springfield, Mass. | Joseph A. Demers 6 C | F. H. Sibley 2 C | (Board of Selectmen) | T. M. Beach 5 B | William Ridgway 5 B p |
| West Warwick, R. I. | Thomas E. Harrop | | William Rathbun† | Arthur O. Lavalley | |
| Wewoka, Okla. | J. R. Robertson 2 B | E. E. Shiflett 2 B | A. M. Seran 3 E | H. A. Dinsmore 3 B | S. H. Anglemyer 2 B p |
| Weymouth, Mass. | Edward F. Butler‡ | J. Ralph Bacon‡ | Thomas J. Kelly† | Fred O. Stevens B | |
| Wheeling, W. Va. | Joseph Burkhard 2 C | Edward Rose 2 C | Harry Conrad 10 M† | J. Shull M | Harry Corcoran 1 B p |
| White Plains, N. Y. | William Miller 6 | Abbot Griffin 11 | Eugene Halpin, Jr. | William I. Collyer | Frank T. Hanlon r |
| Whiting, Ind. | Clay C. Collins 4 M | Clyde C. Lampman 4 M | P. D. Sullivan† | James F. Bartuska 4 M | D. P. Spurrier 4 M p |
| Whittier, Calif. | E. L. Essley 10 C | H. M. Topping 8 C | M. R. Bowen† | M. R. Bowen 10 C | William J. Groen 19 C p |
| Wichita, Kans. | O. W. Wilson 6 A | H. H. McCall 7 A | H. P. Musick† | C. H. Kelley | A. MacDonald 14 B p |
| Wichita Falls, Tex. | George H. Hodgins* A | J. L. McClure 27 A | George S. Dobson† | A. H. Douglass* C | Frank Collier* A p |
| Wilkes-Barre, Pa. | J. Russell Taylor 6 M | Ambrose Saricks 1 M | Benjamin F. Williams† | Rulison Evans | Thomas Phillips 10 C p |
| Wilkinsburg, Pa. | James Harris | Samuel H. Jeffries | John C. Deal† | W. C. Hawley | Harold Grim rs |
| Williamsport, Pa. | J. W. Good 2 C | M. J. Clark 9 C | George W. German 7 E | | P. A. McGowan 3 E pr |
| Willimantic, Conn. | Thomas F. Grady 9 | Charles A. Reynolds 5 | Alex J. Caisse, Jr.† | H. S. Moulton 47‡ | Alex J. Caisse, Jr. 2‡ p |
| Wilmette, Ill. | Henry Brautigam 8 M | W. H. Zibble 15 M | C. C. Schultz 17 M | W. M. Olson 1 M | P. Ericson B p |
| Wilmington, Del. | H. M. Boyd 10‡ | W. Lutz 14‡ | Frank Pierson† | C. Wills 10 | E. R. Mack 15 B p |
| Wilmington, N. C. | J. S. Lane 11 C | J. F. Zellers 2 C | J. E. L. Wade 10 E | M. Maffitt 11 C | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wilson, N. C. | John R. Gurley 8 A | Ed. W. Davis 1 A | James D. Blount† | P. G. Turner 20 A |  |
| Winchester, Mass. | William H. Rogers 5‡ | David H. DeCourcy 22 | Parker Holbrook 7 C† | Harry W. Dotten 9 B | Thomas P. McGowan 1 B p |
| Winchester, Va. | C. W. Hollis 4 C | C. Lee Barr 4 C | Arthur M. Field* C | S. Lee Grant 5 A | C. Vernon Eddy 6 C p |
| Winnetka, Ill. | W. M. Peterson 21 A | G. M. Houren 16 A | H. J. Bohnen 10 A | H. L. Woolhiser 18 C | H. L. Woolhiser p |
| Winona, Minn. | Herman C. Riebau‡ | H. G. Putnam‡ | William J. Speck‡† | Henry Magnus‡ |  |
| Winston-Salem, N. C. | W. F. Anderson* C | W. G. Hobson 2 C | Harry L. Shaner 14 C | C. E. Carter 15 | Loyd B. Hathaway r |
| Winthrop, Mass. | William H. Pumphret 1 C | Warren H. Belcher 10 C | Timothy J. Mahaney† | Howard Shattuck C | Arthur Floyd B p |
| Woburn, Mass. | Charles R. McCauley‡ | Frank E. Tracy‡ | James E. Greaney‡ | Thomas Kenney‡ |  |
| Woonsocket, R. I. | Alfred O. Perron E | Augustin J. Cote E | Alphonse A. Fugere 2 E | Alphonse A. Fugere 2 E | Alphonse A. Fugere 2 E p |
| Wooster, Ohio | Henry Leiner 31 M | Herbert Young 6 M |  | George Allspaugh 1 B | J. B. Rahl B p |
| Worcester, Mass. | Thomas F. Foley 7 M | Charles L. McCarthy 13 C | Everett W. Jenkins† | Leon A. Goodale 7 C | Thos. E. Holland 20 B pr |
| Wyandotte, Mich. | William P. Rutledge 3 M | Gustav Anselm 4 B |  | Hoyte E. Allen 10 B |  |
| Xenia, Ohio | Ozni H. Cornwell 4 A | Herman Fisher 4 A | Arley Smith† | M. C. Smith 6 C |  |
| Yakima, Wash. | Harold Robinson M | Ray Hare M | George W. Clark 3 E | N. A. Gilman M | George W. Clark 3 E pr |
| Yonkers, N. Y. | Edward Quirk 8‡ | Arthur Chambers 4‡ | Edward J. Murray 3 M | M. J. Harmony 3‡ | William J. McGeory 2‡ p |
| York, Pa. | C. P. Gerber 3 C | L. Ellis Wagner 5 C | Frank H. Brenneman† | Edgar P. Kable | V. K. Dayhoff 5 E p |
| Youngstown, Ohio | Roy Goodwin 3 M | Harry Callan 7 M | Grant M. Cook 3 M | Dan Parish 3 M | Lionel Evans 25 M p |
| Ypsilanti, Mich. | R. L. Southard 6 B | A. H. Miller 12 B | T. Fred Older 15 B | B. F. Hodges 25 B | N. C. Sherwood M p |
| Zanesville, Ohio | Herbert Kimberly 4‡ | Charles H. Hatfield 1‡ | John Combs 1 M | Charles McLaughlin 19 | J. T. Walker rs |

## PART FOUR

# FINANCIAL STATISTICS OF CITIES

Receipts, Valuations, Delinquent Taxes

Expenditures

Indebtedness

# Financial Statistics of Cities

THE financial data in this section are a rough summary of the financial transactions of cities in the United States of over 30,000 population, covering the fiscal year ending in 1934. The first table gives assessed valuations, delinquent taxes, and receipts classified into the major sources: general, school, utilities, and bond proceeds. The second table gives expenditures similarly classified. The third table gives indebtedness, both bonded and unfunded, and indicates the bonds issued and redeemed during the year.

The cities reporting number 239 of which 17 could be included only in the debt table because of insufficient data on receipts and expenditures. These 239 cities, tabulated in whole or in part, are 77 per cent of the 310 cities over 30,000 population in the United States. By population groups the returns are segregated as follows: (a) over 500,000 population, returns for all 13 cities; (b) 200,000 to 500,000, 22 returns out of 28; (c) 100,000 to 200,000, 41 returns out of 52; and (d) 30,000 to 100,000 population, 163 returns out of 217. The 71 cities not reporting, or not furnishing usable financial data are listed on page 341.

The data were obtained by the questionnaire method from finance officers and city managers immediately following the close of 1934. The following definitions and instructions accompanied the questionnaire:

## GENERAL

Give financial data as of end of the fiscal year ending any time during 1934. In giving the figures, do not include under either receipts or expenditures any inter-fund transfers. Give figures on cash basis; not accrual. If city schools are under independent district, please try to secure figures if convenient, disregarding difference in fiscal year and size of district, but ignore all other overlapping districts.

## RECEIPTS

*General property tax.* Include special assessment collections, but do not include school taxes. Where city collects state and county taxes, give only the city's portion.

*Grants and shares.* Include shares of county- or state-collected taxes, except general property tax, and all grants and reimbursements from superior governments; loan portion of PWA loans and grants should be reported under "Proceeds of Bond Sales"; do not include school or utility grants and shares.

*Other local revenues.* Include all other revenues than general property tax and grants and shares, such as municipal excise, gasoline, sales taxes, licenses, fees, sales, interest or sinking fund earnings; include also service charges for sewer, garbage collection, etc., unless these services are wholly self-sustaining and treated as regular utilities, in which case include the revenues under the caption "Utilities"; do not include miscellaneous revenues of schools or utilities.

*Borrowing against current revenue.* Include actual proceeds of tax anticipation notes sold (whether for delinquent, current, or future taxes or assessments); if interest-bearing warrants are included here in lieu of anticipation notes, be sure any redemptions are shown under Expenditures; if issued scrip is included here, be sure any redemptions are shown either under Expenditures as "Repayment current borrowings" (if redeemed in cash) or under Receipts as tax collections (if accepted for taxes or assessments); do not include here any "borrowing against current revenue" for schools or utilities.

*School receipts.* Include all revenues for schools (general tax, grants and shares, miscellaneous revenues) and any current borrowing for schools; include the grant portion of PWA loans and grants, but the loan portion, as well as the proceeds of any regular school bond issues, should be reported under "Proceeds of Bond Sales."

*Utility receipts.* Include all revenues for utilities (water, light, gas, street railway, etc.) both commercial and miscellaneous revenues and grants, and current borrowings; loan portion of PWA grants and loans, as well as the proceeds of any regular bond issues for utility purposes, should be reported under "Proceeds of Bond Sales."

*Proceeds of Bond Sales.* Include amount actually received from bonds sold by city for relief purposes, capital outlay, PWA loans, RFC loans, sale of utility and school bonds, special assessment bonds, and bonds issued to fund floating debt. Do not include refunding bond transactions. Give only net amount after refunding amounts have been excluded.

### EXPENDITURES

*Welfare and relief* (from current revenues). Include all welfare and relief disbursements of any type—institutional, home, or work-relief, *made by the city,* whether ultimately financed by reimbursements or grants from other governments or not; include any city disbursements for materials, equipment, and miscellaneous expense incidental to work-relief projects; include here any *school* or *utility* disbursements for work-relief projects; do not include any relief disbursements from the proceeds of bonds, as these are reported under "Expenditures from the proceeds of bonds."

*Current operation and maintenance.* Include all expenditures for operation of all city departments and functions, except those for welfare and relief, debt service, outlays, repayment current borrowings, schools, utilities, and bond fund outlays.

*Debt service.* Include all note interest, bond interest, serial bond redemption, and current year's contribution to any bond sinking funds; include special assessment debt service; do not include "debt service" for schools and utilities.

*Capital outlays from current revenues.* Include here only *general* outlays from current revenues, except work-relief expenditures which are reported under "Relief" above; do not include outlays for schools or utilities; do not include expenditures from proceeds of bond issues.

*Repayment current borrowings.* Include only the principal of any current borrowings redeemed during the year, the interest being included in "debt service" above; do not include any repayment of current borrowing for schools or utilities.

*School expenditures.* Include all expenditures for current operation and maintenance, for debt service, for outlays (from current revenues, including PWA *grants*), for repayment of current borrowings, for *schools;* do not include any work-relief expenditures, as these are reported under "Welfare and Relief" above; do not include any outlays (buildings, etc.) from the proceeds of bond sales.

*Utilities expenditures.* Include all expenditures for current operation and maintenance, for debt service, for outlays from current revenues (including PWA *grants*), for repayment of current borrowings, for *utilities;* do not include any work-relief expenditures, as these are reported under "Welfare and Relief" above; do not include any outlays (extensions, buildings, etc.) from the proceeds of bond sales.

*Expenditures from proceeds of bonds.* Include disbursements from bond sales whether for general purposes, school purposes, or utility purposes; include outlays financed by sale of special assessment bonds, disbursements from PWA *loans,* relief expenditures financed by bond sales, and RFC loans for relief or other purposes.

## DEBT, VALUATIONS, AND DELINQUENT TAXES

*Bonded debt.* Net debt is gross debt less amounts set aside in sinking funds for redemption thereof; special assessment bonds are those issued in anticipation of the collection of special assessments; utility bonds are those issued for utility purposes; school bonds are those for school purposes; and general bonds are all others.

*Bonds issued and redeemed during 1934.* Do not include refunding amounts in either the issues or redemptions; include bonds for all purposes.

*Unfunded debt.* Include notes, interest-bearing warrants, scrip, and overdue bills.

*Assessed property valuation.* Include real and personal property valuations only; exclude special classes of property, such as intangibles, which are taxed at special, low rates.

*Accumulated delinquent taxes, end of year.* Include, if possible, all delinquent taxes for both school and general purposes, covering both current and prior years; do not include shares of delinquent taxes, if any, belonging to county or state.

The financial statistics sent in on standard forms were not audited or checked for compliance with the issued definitions and instructions except in the case of inconsistencies which appeared on the face of the figures given. In such cases correspondence was carried on with the finance officers in an effort to clarify these discrepancies. It is thought that because of the detailed definitions and instructions issued, the data this year will be more accurate than in the 1934 YEAR BOOK. Since only the questionnaire method was used, however, there is of course no guarantee that the instructions issued were followed by those who prepared the statements. For example, it is possible that the figures for some cities may not properly include all of the funds which should be included. Special assessment and other special funds may have been omitted in many cities, although the instructions contemplated incorporating these under the "general" caption. Then, too, the general receipts and expenditures in some cities may not include activities like libraries and parks, because of the fact that a governmental set-up provides independent boards or taxing authorities, and the data for these may not have been secured and included. A school tax adjustment had to be made generally in the case of New Jersey, New York, and New England cities, where schools are financed out of the general city taxes; in order to show school receipts as approximately equivalent to school expenditures, a portion of the general city tax was split out and shown under school receipts. Attention is also directed to the fact that where independent school districts exist no adjustment was made to compensate for difference in area. The school receipts, expenditures, and debts reported, therefore, may represent overlapping school districts covering larger areas than their central cities.

Great care, therefore, needs to be exercised in the use of the figures in these summary tables. Because of the method of collection, the possibility of misinterpretation of instructions, the lack of actual audit, and the differences in governmental set-up and the services performed by cities, it is hazardous to use the statistics for inter-city comparison.

Not only are there great differences in the services rendered by the different cities, but in some major respects whole categories of service are absent in some cities and present in others. For example, in North Carolina, the cities no longer have any substantial expense in connection with schools since they have been taken over by the state. In Virginia the cities perform traditional county functions such as the support of the court system. Many New England communities of urban characteristics and size are legally town governments which perform not only the traditional city functions but also town functions of poor relief, etc. Another example of the impropriety of using the expenditure figures for cost purposes in comparing cities with each other is school expenditures. These are not segregated as are the "general" expenditures, and in those cities where the tax collection calendar does not conform with the expenditure calendar large current borrowings are necessary and the repayment of these borrowings may unduly inflate school expenditures.

## TABLE IX

### RECEIPTS, ASSESSED VALUATIONS, AND DELINQUENT TAXES IN 1934 OF 222 CITIES OVER 30,000

Cities are arranged alphabetically by population groups; those not reporting are listed on page 341. An asterisk (*) refers to notes on page 341; † indicates that delinquent school taxes are included.

| City | Pop. 1930 (000 omitted) | Assessed Valuations | End of Fiscal Year | General Receipts (except schools, utilities, and bond proceeds) | | | | | School Receipts (except Bond Proceeds) | Utility Receipts (except Bond Proceeds) | Proceeds of Bond Sales (all Purposes) | Total Accumulated Delinquent Taxes End of Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Property Taxes & Assessments (all local purposes except Schools) | Grants and Shares from Other Governments | Other Local Revenue | Borrowing Against Current Revenue | Total General Receipts | | | | |
| ***Over 500,000*** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baltimore, Md. .... | 805 | $1,829,881,978 | Dec. 31 | $ 21,952,624 | $ ........ | $ 9,024,584 | ........ | $ 30,977,208 | $10,765,979 | $ 3,927,938 | $ 1,653,000 | $ 7,887,530† |
| Boston, Mass. .... | 781 | 1,683,500,000 | Dec. 31 | 40,890,547 | 6,377,274 | 13,586,404 | 54,300,000 | 115,154,226 | 16,286,709 | 7,555,499 | 5,679,000 | 24,222,257† |
| Buffalo, N. Y. .... | 573 | 969,222,560 | June 30 | 13,634,053 | 7,932,549 | 1,532,270 | 3,000,000* | 26,098,873 | 11,560,930 | 2,415,166 | 3,717,684* | 6,387,756† |
| Chicago, Ill. ...... | 3,376 | 2,397,652,228 | Dec. 31 | 27,139,748 | ........ | 16,575,995 | 34,331,966 | 78,047,709 | 71,774,355 | 13,575,554 | 21,934,593* | 61,351,285† |
| Cleveland, Ohio ... | 900 | 1,029,110,500 | Dec. 31 | 14,360,555 | None | 18,352,813 | 930,000 | 33,643,358 | 13,416,668 | 8,204,351 | 7,546,000 | 9,835,856 |
| Detroit, Mich. .... | 1,569 | 2,251,405,970 | June 30 | 45,235,093 | 9,207,869 | 8,997,313 | 3,940,449 | 67,380,724 | 20,683,082 | 23,095,764 | ........ | 58,593,758† |
| Los Angeles, Calif. . | 1,238 | 1,123,413,030 | June 30 | 22,879,842 | 4,098,180 | 7,387,677 | None | 34,365,699 | 19,013,768 | 23,531,782 | 11,920,257 | 5,492,519 |
| Milwaukee, Wis. ... | 578 | 857,898,150 | Dec. 31 | 11,246,853 | ........ | 6,200,380 | ........ | 17,447,233 | 9,623,295 | 2,208,158 | ........ | 11,393,619† |
| New York, N. Y. ... | 6,930 | 17,149,236,557 | Dec. 31 | 373,209,456 | 115,617,173 | 73,641,972 | 446,650,000 | 1,009,118,601 | 153,067,182* | 55,627,232 | 30,291,000 | 180,306,340† |
| Philadelphia, Pa. .. | 1,951 | 3,908,269,445 | Dec. 31 | 58,077,029 | ........ | 6,311,547 | 9,160,000 | 73,548,576 | 35,097,315 | 12,366,899 | 2,704,100 | 50,241,205† |
| Pittsburgh, Pa. .... | 670 | 1,172,084,770 | Dec. 31 | 15,722,725 | None | 4,662,718 | None | 20,385,443 | ........ | 2,881,816 | 7,207,000 | 14,120,274 |
| St. Louis, Mo. .... | 822 | 1,030,373,704 | Apr. 9 | 17,771,130 | 326,193 | 5,291,946 | None | 23,389,270 | 10,272,845 | 3,700,213 | 8,200,000 | 15,270,701† |
| San Francisco, Calif.. | 634 | 737,510,766 | June 30 | 22,690,338 | 4,343,129 | 4,420,140 | 7,616,552* | 39,070,160 | 9,198,400 | 11,662,600 | 3,504,010 | 2,543,466† |
| ***200,000 to 500,000*** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Atlanta, Ga. ...... | 270 | 348,110,756 | Dec. 31 | 2,752,951 | ........ | 1,903,392 | 1,240,892 | 5,907,234 | 3,306,709 | 1,744,509 | None | 1,625,457† |
| Birmingham, Ala. .. | 260 | 267,764,962 | Dec. 31 | 2,120,380 | 85,163 | 1,255,224 | None | 3,401,332 | 2,578,346 | None | None | 578,288† |
| Cincinnati, Ohio .. | 451 | 816,229,000 | Dec. 31 | 9,469,280 | 1,423,180 | 6,107,209 | 135,000 | 17,234,669 | 8,351,855 | 2,530,984 | 2,988,992* | 1,857,415 |
| Columbus, Ohio .. | 291 | 348,471,630 | Dec. 31 | 3,770,784 | 378,014 | 2,377,420 | 606,500 | 7,132,719 | ........ | 1,345,050 | ........ | 1,030,916 |
| Dallas, Texas ..... | 260 | 243,703,900 | Sept. 30 | 3,607,407 | 186,634 | 1,527,239 | None | 5,321,281 | 3,917,341 | 1,462,457 | 492,124 | 2,502,250† |
| Dayton, Ohio ..... | 201 | 278,725,344 | Dec. 31 | 2,891,305 | 717,353 | ........ | 375,000 | ........ | 3,503,870 | 813,576 | 536,562 | 3,677,959 |
| Denver, Colo. .... | 288 | 348,291,840 | Dec. 31 | 5,671,761 | ........ | 2,567,263 | None | 8,239,024 | 5,669,854 | 2,508,345 | 1,122,124 | 1,254,610 |
| Kansas City, Mo. .. | 400 | 540,263,280 | Apr. 30 | 6,299,499 | ........ | 2,365,374 | 750,000 | 9,414,873 | 5,625,852 | 2,152,124 | 2,025,000 | 911,041 |
| Louisville, Ky. .... | 308 | 380,500,650 | Aug. 31 | 6,395,034 | None | 227,282 | 1,000,000 | 8,622,317 | 2,550,765 | 1,564,637 | 250,000 | 2,689,552† |
| Minneapolis, Minn. . | 464 | 285,119,121 | Dec. 31 | 12,604,541 | ........ | 2,066,658 | 150,000 | 14,821,199 | 8,596,023 | 1,455,209 | 4,887,151* | 11,245,886† |
| Newark, N. J. .... | 442 | 735,318,053* | Dec. 31 | 12,741,687 | 2,066,142 | 4,181,810 | 38,257,000 | 57,246,639 | 9,800,567 | 2,446,341 | 13,508,000 | 19,217,770† |
| Oakland, Calif. .... | 284 | 226,044,834 | June 30 | 4,947,527 | None | 861,027 | None | 5,908,554 | 5,668,018 | 561,551* | 204,358 | 575,216 |
| Omaha, Nebr. .... | 214 | 239,220,516 | Dec. 31 | 3,567,256 | 44,159 | 600,182 | ........ | 4,211,597 | 3,682,598 | ........ | ........ | 3,600,000† |
| Portland, Ore. .... | 302 | 289,499,095 | Nov. 30 | 5,641,570 | 36,194 | 1,020,103 | 4,027,056 | 10,724,923 | 5,782,209 | 2,090,264 | 2,588,171 | 4,586,944 |

TABLE IX.—RECEIPTS, ASSESSED VALUATIONS, AND DELINQUENT TAXES IN 1934 OF CITIES OVER 30,000—Continued

*See notes on page 341; † includes delinquent school taxes.

| City | Pop. 1930 (000 omitted) | Assessed Valuations | End of Fiscal Year | General Receipts (except schools, utilities, and bond proceeds) | | | | | School Receipts (except Bond Proceeds) | Utility Receipts (except Bond Proceeds) | Proceeds of Bond Sales (all Purposes) | Total Accumulated Delinquent Taxes End of Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Property Taxes & Assessments (all local purposes except Schools) | Grants and Shares from Other Governments | Other Local Revenue | Borrowing Against Current Revenue | Total General Receipts | | | | |
| ***200,000 to 500,000—continued*** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Providence, R. I. .. | 253 | $ 492,243,300 | Sept. 30 | $ 7,233,638 | $ 196,053 | $3,297,467 | $2,688,319 | $13,415,477 | $ 4,875,318 | $1,545,624 | $2,050,000 | $........ |
| Rochester, N. Y. .. | 328 | 631,908,496 | Dec. 31 | 11,047,782 | 4,748,589 | 3,038,217 | 2,200,000 | 21,034,588 | 8,413,923 | 1,481,631 | 5,702,000* | 7,368,232* |
| St. Paul, Minn. .. | 272 | 134,365,491 | Dec. 31 | 3,935,622 | ........ | 1,663,814 | 1,495,000 | 7,084,436 | 2,964,161 | 987,617 | 1,686,000 | 4,023,226† |
| San Antonio, Tex. .. | 232 | 208,436,170 | May 31 | 3,462,318 | None | 257,630 | 1,448,000 | 5,167,949 | 4,375,674 | 1,124,159 | None | 4,857,843 |
| Syracuse, N. Y.* .... | 209 | ........ | Dec. 31 | 5,077,997 | 2,824,463 | 4,435,887 | 700,000 | 13,038,347 | 3,936,806 | 881,174 | ........ | 4,731,576† |
| Washington, D. C. . | 487 | 1,681,497,219 | June 30 | 14,788,530 | 9,766,237 | 4,931,997 | None | 29,486,764 | 10,260,736 | 3,585,043 | None | 4,639,002† |
| ***100,000 to 200,000*** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Albany, N. Y. .... | 127 | 236,774,545 | Dec. 31 | 5,353,982 | 483,059 | 661,616 | 2,350,000 | 8,848,657 | 2,471,329 | 849,835 | 950,000 | ........ |
| Camden, N. J. .... | 119 | 150,807,698 | Dec. 31 | 2,132,287 | ........ | 1,118,656 | ........ | 3,250,943 | 1,500,999 | 405,013 | 49,500 | 4,602,872† |
| Canton, Ohio .... | 105 | 133,581,120 | Dec. 31 | 328,801 | 176,684 | 389,017 | 40,000 | 934,503 | ........ | 349,971 | 315,775 | 322,108 |
| Chattanooga, Tenn.* | 120 | 113,261,180 | Dec. 31 | 1,786,153 | 55,854 | 342,102 | 690,000 | 2,874,109 | 1,018,883 | ........ | ........ | 1,256,513 |
| Des Moines, Iowa.. | 143 | 140,572,191 | Mar. 31 | 2,247,654 | 80,000 | 300,000 | ........ | 2,627,654 | 3,295,158 | 892,211 | 1,081,347 | ........ |
| Duluth, Minn. .... | 101 | 56,131,807 | Dec. 31 | 1,805,495 | ........ | 425,668 | 345,000 | 2,576,164 | ........ | 1,245,345 | 51,000 | 1,278,112 |
| Elizabeth, N. J. ... | 115 | 157,157,050 | Dec. 31 | 2,548,909 | 355,986 | 516,535 | 2,300,000 | 5,721,430 | 2,269,838 | 1,700,000 | 4,800,000 | 4,410,000† |
| El Paso, Tex. ...... | 102 | 82,381,330 | Feb. 28 | 1,569,600 | None | 714,280 | ........ | 2,283,881 | 733,608 | 444,801 | None | 2,051,446† |
| Erie, Pa. .......... | 116 | 146,633,388 | Dec. 31 | 1,821,293 | None | 138,170 | 390,000 | 2,349,463 | 2,280,160 | 601,453 | 288,472 | 3,736,204† |
| Evansville, Ind. ... | 102 | 111,938,020 | Dec. 31 | 1,075,117 | None | 314,203 | None | 1,389,321 | 1,319,795 | 556,947 | None | 328,458 |
| Fall River, Mass. ... | 115 | 108,995,500 | Dec. 31 | 2,872,397 | 558,884 | 922,151 | 3,838,000 | 8,191,432 | 1,521,399 | 374,781 | None | 1,504,146 |
| Flint, Mich. ...... | 156 | 171,119,400 | June 30 | 1,838,886 | 22,863 | 132,698 | None | 1,954,187 | 2,982,051 | 789,634 | None | 4,580,442† |
| Fort Wayne, Ind. .. | 115 | 146,676,430 | Dec. 31 | 798,973 | 128,004 | 184,019 | ........ | 1,110,996 | ........ | 1,561,645 | None | ........ |
| Fort Worth, Tex. .. | 164 | 169,261,424 | Sept. 30 | 2,566,594 | ........ | 585,641 | 1,437,094 | 4,589,329 | 2,340,733 | 930,967 | 51,000 | 3,984,770† |
| Gary, Ind. ........ | 100 | 124,042,860 | Dec. 31 | 1,705,134 | 114,440 | 62,499 | 360,000 | 2,242,073 | 1,246,565 | None | None | 800,000 |
| Grand Rapids, Mich. | 169 | 185,126,150 | Mar. 31 | 2,503,103 | 487,138 | 446,292 | None | 3,436,534 | 3,194,413 | 836,307 | None | 3,861,871† |
| Hartford, Conn. .. | 164 | 359,247,435 | Mar. 31 | 4,765,059 | 561,060 | 1,091,090 | ........ | 6,417,309 | ........ | 1,031,974 | 3,057,600* | ........ |
| Jacksonville, Fla. ... | 130 | 85,382,240 | Dec. 31 | 1,695,193 | ........ | 235,672 | ........ | 1,930,865 | ........ | 3,634,899 | ........ | 2,162,098 |
| Knoxville, Tenn. .. | 106 | 116,100,000 | Dec. 31 | 2,856,912 | ........ | 355,043 | 3,759,288 | 6,971,184 | 796,903 | 613,182 | 240,000 | 2,719,725† |
| Long Beach, Calif.. | 142 | 173,977,805 | June 30 | 2,498,250 | None | 1,021,070 | None | 3,519,320 | ........ | 2,345,023 | None | 671,651 |
| Lowell, Mass. ..... | 100 | 110,301,987 | Dec. 31 | 2,782,495 | 52,775 | 1,218,642 | 3,549,800 | 7,603,711 | 1,268,147 | 328,571 | 882,500 | 2,099,654† |
| Lynn, Mass. ....... | 102 | 142,262,380 | Dec. 31 | 4,800,611 | None | 1,171,796 | 5,904,000 | 11,876,907 | 1,475,472 | 452,570 | 795,000 | 1,714,058† |
| Miami, Fla. ...... | 111 | 102,024,294 | June 30 | 3,417,176 | None | 909,035 | None | 4,326,211 | 1,343,497 | 520,710 | 20,500 | 2,496,003 |
| New Haven, Conn. . | 163 | 310,942,766 | Dec. 31 | 6,247,896 | 265,921 | 496,821 | 681,972 | 7,692,610 | 2,602,470 | None | 150,411 | 2,865,300† |
| Norfolk, Va. ...... | 130 | 169,970,175 | Dec. 31 | 3,229,043 | ........ | 1,480,484 | 1,230,000 | 5,939,528 | 1,488,313 | 849,919* | 1,525,000 | 5,780,680† |
| Oklahoma City, Okla. | 185 | 111,147,579 | Dec. 31 | 2,954,434 | 50,424 | 1,297,650 | None | 4,302,509 | 3,371,309 | 920,455 | None | 576,222 |
| Reading, Pa. ...... | 111 | 170,250,000 | Jan. 7 | 1,570,078 | ........ | 298,935 | 400,000 | 2,269,014 | 2,631,383 | 594,894 | 3,135,000 | 2,411,390† |
| Salt Lake City, Utah | 140 | 148,628,357 | Dec. 31 | 1,825,537 | ........ | 414,758 | 1,550,000 | 3,790,295 | 2,282,751 | 555,087 | 425,000* | 1,127,094 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scranton, Pa. ...... | 143 | 121,733,600 | Dec. 31 | 1,890,521 | 13,047 | 380,000 | 170,000 | 2,453,568 | 2,574,209 | ........ | 306,374 | ........ |
| South Bend, Ind. .. | 104 | 131,493,830 | Dec. 31 | 720,473 | None | 219,241 | None | 939,713 | ........ | 430,695 | None | ........ |
| Spokane, Wash. .... | 116 | 68,014,295 | Dec. 30 | 1,332,074 | 99,620 | 766,514 | None | 2,198,208 | 1,618,851 | 603,445 | 150,000 | 1,308,470† |
| Springfield, Mass. .. | 150 | 285,140,020 | Nov. 30 | 4,911,651 | 1,163,317 | 2,443,607 | 8,500,000 | 17,018,575 | 3,677,627 | 1,057,168 | 400,000 | 3,045,698† |
| Tacoma, Wash. ... | 107 | 50,911,422 | Dec. 31 | 1,020,940 | 27,358 | 503,650 | 1,082,616 | 2,634,563 | 1,322,824 | 2,950,922 | 250,000 | 2,245,797† |
| Tampa, Fla. ...... | 101 | 105,176,265 | May 31 | 1,290,695 | ........ | 460,545 | 408,000 | 2,159,240 | ........ | 469,347 | ........ | 3,042,013 |
| Trenton, N. J. .... | 123 | 178,522,399 | Dec. 31 | 2,474,922 | ........ | 1,260,588 | 385,500 | 4,121,010 | 2,113,785 | 562,447 | 434,989* | 5,876,102† |
| Wichita, Kans. .... | 111 | 110,708,142 | Dec. 31 | 1,651,362 | 11,647 | 264,335 | None | 1,927,345 | 3,179,562 | ........ | 168,179 | ........ |
| Wilmington, Del. .. | 107 | 151,382,475 | June 30 | 2,075,898 | ........ | 132,815 | 158,000 | 2,366,713 | ........ | 469,887 | None | 800,594† |
| Worcester, Mass. ... | 195 | 306,671,050 | Nov. 30 | 7,672,971 | 1,407,881 | 858,882 | 11,080,000 | 21,019,734 | 3,261,000 | 826,284 | 2,374,000 | 3,864,201† |
| ***30,000 to 100,000*** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alameda, Calif. .... | 35 | 33,812,552 | June 30 | 422,775 | ........ | 108,708 | ........ | 531,483 | 758,572 | 572,840 | ........ | 75,182† |
| Allentown, Pa. .... | 93 | 102,596,000 | Dec. 31 | 1,262,296 | 12,500 | 192,849 | 115,000 | 1,582,645 | 1,676,194 | 270,564 | 420,000* | 800,819 |
| Alton, Ill. ........ | 30 | 16,679,889 | Dec. 31 | 111,300 | ........ | 61,585 | 101,600 | 274,485 | ........ | None | None | 194,000† |
| Altoona, Pa. ...... | 82 | 75,830,146 | Dec. 31 | 461,467 | 8,477 | 98,444 | 350,000 | 918,389 | 1,218,466 | 225,633 | 400,000* | 525,000 |
| Amarillo, Tex. .... | 43 | 48,362,210 | Apr. 16 | 471,335 | None | 86,692 | 351,941 | 909,968 | 632,865 | 308,991 | None | 807,673† |
| Arlington, Mass. ... | 36 | 62,217,530 | Dec. 31 | 1,208,004 | 170,198 | 253,580 | 1,300,000 | 2,931,782 | 784,456 | 171,133 | None | 719,096† |
| Asheville, N. C. ... | 50 | 51,114,748 | June 30 | 751,905 | None | 145,669 | None | 897,574 | None | 270,921 | None | 1,426,000† |
| Auburn, N. Y.... | 37 | 52,224,930 | June 30 | 564,767 | ........ | 452,038 | 160,000 | 1,176,805 | 585,630 | 181,152 | 394,972* | 135,097† |
| Austin, Tex. ...... | 53 | 49,664,590 | Dec. 31 | 778,112 | None | 290,736 | None | 1,068,849 | 573,232 | 1,190,906 | ........ | 624,637† |
| Baton Rouge, La. .. | 31 | 36,586,003 | Dec. 31 | 478,806 | ........ | 118,266 | 150,000 | 747,072 | ........ | ........ | ........ | 16,520 |
| Bay City, Mich. .... | 47 | 39,019,821 | June 30 | 554,744 | 1,800 | 399,655 | 385,925 | 1,342,125 | 790,605 | 540,337 | ........ | 668,726 |
| Beaumont, Tex. .... | 58 | 55,938,110 | Dec. 31 | 923,471 | None | 156,682 | 223,500 | 1,303,652 | 548,565 | 341,795 | None | 1,576,777† |
| Bellingham, Wash. .. | 31 | 13,206,315 | Dec. 31 | 267,494 | 28,023 | 46,938 | None | 342,456 | ........ | 170,247 | None | 188,346 |
| Berkeley, Calif. .... | 82 | 80,637,925 | June 30 | 997,527 | 35,182 | 413,200 | None | 1,445,910 | 2,010,028 | 1,101,037* | None | 140,899 |
| Berwyn, Ill. ...... | 47 | 21,487,218 | Dec. 31 | 249,744 | ........ | 290,826 | 188,705 | 729,274 | ........ | ........ | 141,000* | 932,483 |
| Bethlehem, Pa. .... | 58 | 67,000,000 | Dec. 31 | 767,526 | None | 91,346 | 145,000 | 993,872 | ........ | 263,179 | ........ | 725,000 |
| Binghamton, N. Y. .. | 77 | 111,517,911 | Dec. 31 | 2,615,389 | 391,671 | 1,654,289 | None | 4,661,350 | 1,381,266 | 248,937 | 1,238,000 | 27,094† |
| Bloomfield, N. J. .. | 38 | 69,491,414 | Dec. 31 | 799,385 | None | 341,219 | 1,750,000 | 2,890,603 | ........ | 246,295 | 45,000* | 1,023,945† |
| Brookline, Mass. .. | 47 | 168,275,090 | Dec. 31 | 2,288,466 | 38,041 | 914,141 | 1,700,000 | 4,940,649 | 878,092 | 298,149 | 103,000 | 773,917† |
| Charleston, W. Va. . | 60 | 108,809,106 | June 30 | 389,119 | ........ | 85,624 | ........ | 474,743 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ |
| Charlotte, N. C. ... | 83 | 104,493,718 | June 30 | 1,630,388 | ........ | 604,429 | 50,000 | 2,284,817 | 413,197 | 439,202 | 271,053 | 866,222† |
| Chelsea, Mass. .... | 46 | 47,737,200 | Dec. 31 | 1,181,279 | 207,839 | 350,740 | 2,222,143 | 3,962,002 | 640,224 | 173,968 | 160,000 | 1,557,445† |
| Chester, Pa. ...... | 59 | 54,101,508 | Dec. 31 | 600,047 | 45,103 | 133,740 | 100,000 | 778,892 | ........ | None | None | 616,000 |
| Chicopee, Mass. .... | 44 | 42,000,000 | Dec. 31 | 1,282,662 | 17,422 | 801,833 | 1,450,000 | 3,551,918 | 439,978 | 598,526 | None | 822,664 |
| Cleveland Hgts., Ohio | 51 | 103,021,860 | Dec. 31 | 1,727,442 | 37,830 | 217,908 | None | 1,983,181 | ........ | 418,853 | 35,099 | 557,413 |
| Clifton, N. J. ...... | 47 | 48,102,141 | Dec. 31 | 546,526 | 59,132 | 111,381 | 103,561 | 820,600 | 588,454 | 79,479* | 555,680 | 1,206,599 |
| Colorado Spgs., Colo. | 33 | 28,636,030 | Dec. 31 | 364,486 | None | 218,909 | None | 583,395 | 766,546 | 1,151,900 | 350,000 | 76,540 |
| Columbus, Ga. .... | 43 | 35,450,000 | Dec. 31 | 459,534 | None | 239,019 | None | 698,553 | 294,028 | 196,064 | None | 215,816† |
| Council Bluffs, Iowa | 42 | 22,158,179 | Mar. 31 | 442,800 | 3,745 | 68,047 | 56,000 | 570,592 | 620,749 | 227,438 | None | 104,387 |
| Cumberland, Md. .. | 38 | 43,462,025 | Dec. 31 | 413,436 | ........ | 102,804 | 319,875 | 836,115 | ........ | 240,053 | 235,000 | 281,570 |
| Danville, Ill. ...... | 36 | 21,395,839 | Dec. 31 | 280,607 | ........ | 40,000 | 88,000 | 408,607 | ........ | None | None | ........ |
| Dearborn, Mich. .... | 50 | 160,054,495 | June 30 | 972,634 | 412,000 | 177,591 | ........ | 1,562,225 | ........ | 322,541 | ........ | 1,528,354 |
| Decatur, Ill. ...... | 58 | 31,965,000 | Dec. 31 | 359,285 | ........ | 49,710 | 211,000 | 619,996 | 1,569,479 | 244,457 | 291,810 | 90,000 |
| Dubuque, Iowa .... | 42 | 33,011,351 | Dec. 31 | 556,214 | ........ | 168,517 | ........ | 724,731 | 519,921 | 195,233 | 16,100 | 392,038† |

## Table IX.—Receipts, Assessed Valuations, and Delinquent Taxes in 1934 of Cities Over 30,000—Continued

*See notes on page 341; † includes delinquent school taxes.

| City | Pop. 1930 (000 omitted) | Assessed Valuations | End of Fiscal Year | General Receipts (except schools, utilities, and bond proceeds) | | | | | School Receipts (except Bond Proceeds) | Utility Receipts (except Bond Proceeds) | Proceeds of Bond Sales (all Purposes) | Total Accumulated Delinquent Taxes End of Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Property Taxes & Assessments (all local purposes except Schools) | Grants and Shares from Other Governments | Other Local Revenue | Borrowing Against Current Revenue | Total General Receipts | | | | |
| ***30,000 to 100,000—continued*** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Durham, N. C. .... | 52 | $ 65,207,896 | June 30 | $ 1,219,883 | $ None | $ 174,441 | $ None | $1,394,324 | $ 579,468 | $ 433,950 | $ 350,000 | $ 257,996† |
| East Chicago, Ind... | 55 | 75,588,870 | Dec. 31 | 569,372 | 90,084 | 14,182 | 210,090 | 883,729 | ........ | 339,467 | None | 713,591† |
| East Cleveland, O. | 40 | 54,665,470 | Dec. 31 | 563,997 | 93,739 | 46,357 | None | 704,094 | 1,422,212 | 163,115 | None | 102,032† |
| Easton, Pa. ....... | 34 | 44,182,565 | Dec. 31 | 557,013 | 16,450 | 79,238 | 640,000 | 1,292,701 | ........ | ........ | 523,000 | 216,696 |
| East Orange, N. J... | 68 | 123,329,994 | Dec. 31 | 3,875,855 | ........ | 3,333,858 | 1,650,700 | 8,860,413 | 1,756,137 | 364,219 | 2,937,649 | 2,573,639† |
| Egin, Ill. .......... | 36 | 22,294,434 | Dec. 31 | 253,832 | 46,794 | 68,528 | 192,000 | 561,154 | ........ | 121,167 | 67,015 | 25,000 |
| Elkhart, Ind. ...... | 33 | 35,360,000 | Dec. 31 | 211,664 | 31,245 | 138,404 | ........ | 381,313 | 338,680 | 142,053 | None | 316,371† |
| Elmira, N. Y. ..... | 47 | 50,659,416 | Dec. 31 | 1,412,826 | 669,538 | 85,285 | 1,000,000 | 3,167,651 | 821,667 | 402,011 | 126,159 | 408,386* |
| Evanston, Ill. ..... | 63 | 52,954,612 | Dec. 31 | 1,405,213 | ........ | 319,976 | 499,625 | 2,224,814 | ........ | 419,239 | 80,079 | 1,662,257 |
| Fitchburg, Mass. .... | 41 | 50,928,350 | Nov. 30 | 1,495,998 | 53,229 | 247,332 | 1,900,000 | 3,696,558 | 478,646 | 119,971 | 180,000 | 564,739† |
| Fort Smith, Ark. .. | 31 | 15,094,112 | Dec. 31 | 139,521 | None | 144,226 | None | 283,747 | 380,263 | 211,089 | None | ........ |
| Fresno, Calif. ..... | 53 | 43,397,590 | June 30 | 863,075 | None | 264,687 | 300,000 | 1,431,762 | 1,600,261 | 415,335 | None | 125,000 |
| Galveston, Tex. .... | 53 | 58,836,420 | June 30 | 1,070,529 | 171,110 | 313,248 | None | 1,554,887 | ........ | 270,461 | None | 1,154,236 |
| Glendale, Calif. .... | 63 | 49,980,730 | June 30 | 796,774 | 133,515 | 244,673 | None | 1,174,963 | ........ | 1,551,980 | None | 290,801 |
| Green Bay, Wis. .. | 37 | 50,977,155 | Dec. 31 | 568,789 | 163,475 | 321,398 | 17,527 | 1,071,189 | 718,101 | ........ | 3,000 | 277,837† |
| Greensboro, N. C. .. | 54 | 80,506,110 | June 30 | 1,031,194 | ........ | 224,462 | ........ | 1,255,656 | 426,691 | 249,913 | None | 605,178† |
| Hagerstown, Md. .. | 31 | 38,478,097 | Mar. 3 | 321,609 | ........ | 114,860 | ........ | 436,469 | ........ | 482,386 | ........ | 250,883 |
| Hamilton, Ohio .... | 52 | 63,898,255 | Dec. 31 | 414,911 | ........ | 508,834 | 25,000 | 948,745 | ........ | 953,416 | 880,380 | 389,887 |
| Hammond, Ind. .... | 65 | 86,878,530 | Dec. 31 | 488,352 | ........ | 65,324 | 165,000 | 718,676 | 869,469 | 280,323 | ........ | 1,556,272† |
| Hamtramck, Mich. . | 56 | 68,762,804 | June 30 | 1,365,043 | ........ | 478,174 | 320,000 | 1,968,906 | 987,597 | ........ | None | 1,111,220 |
| Harrisburg, Pa. .... | 80 | 90,459,030 | Dec. 31 | 1,355,391 | ........ | 104,967 | 150,279 | 1,610,638 | 1,842,858 | 276,115 | ........ | 739,705† |
| Haverhill, Mass. .. | 49 | 54,896,072 | Dec. 31 | 1,424,407 | 208,271 | 382,718 | 1,960,000 | 3,975,396 | 543,991 | 182,135 | 440,284 | 753,622† |
| Highland, Pk., Mich. | 53 | 77,744,550 | June 30 | 737,983 | 147,429 | 272,070 | 190,000 | 1,347,482 | 1,564,511 | 268,366 | 205,000* | 890,302 |
| High Point, N. C... | 37 | 36,968,742 | June 30 | 643,546 | 9,958 | 123,660 | None | 777,164 | 72,201 | 428,354 | None | 528,789† |
| Hoboken, N. J. .... | 59 | 91,372,128* | Dec. 31 | 3,477,426* | ........ | 1,223,363* | 247,000* | 4,947,790* | ........* | None | None | 3,514,720† |
| Huntington, W. Va. | 76 | 98,167,725 | June 30 | 539,950 | ........ | 75,364 | ........ | 615,314 | ........ | ........ | ........ | 174,488 |
| Irvington, N. J. .... | 57 | 76,054,862 | Dec. 31 | 1,712,515 | ........ | 362,025 | 3,565,948 | 5,644,488 | 477,583 | None | None | 1,167,428† |
| Jackson, Mich. .... | 55 | 67,291,500 | June 30 | 418,956 | 83,188 | 273,661 | None | 775,806 | 916,375 | 107,744 | None | 638,164† |
| Jackson, Miss. .... | 48 | 38,702,533 | Sept. 30 | 813,675 | None | 225,314 | None | 1,038,989 | 296,673 | 193,410 | None | ........ |
| Kalamazoo, Mich. .. | 55 | 71,402,955 | Dec. 31 | 748,628 | ........ | 326,443 | None | 1,075,071 | 1,720,927 | 334,901 | None | 259,918 |
| Kenosha, Wis. .... | 50 | ........ | Dec. 31 | 1,046,067 | 187,033 | 361,534 | ........ | 1,594,636 | 823,340 | 165,371 | 59,000 | 1,341,842† |
| Kokomo, Ind. .... | 33 | 27,037,110 | Dec. 31 | 174,097 | None | 107,065 | None | 281,162 | 264,252 | None | None | 342,510† |
| La Crosse, Wis. .... | 40 | 47,144,405 | Dec. 31 | 387,843 | 111,622 | 274,231 | ........ | 773,697 | 450,645 | 132,801 | 2,100 | 7,313 |
| Lakewood, Ohio ... | 71 | 93,596,900 | Dec. 31 | 873,882 | ........ | 306,303 | 50,000 | 1,230,185 | ........ | ........ | 3,000 | 476,198 |
| Lancaster, Pa. .... | 60 | 88,386,550 | Dec. 31 | 403,906 | ........ | 542,133 | ........ | 946,039 | ........ | ........ | 595,000* | 307,994* |
| Lansing, Mich. .... | 78 | 109,369,700 | Apr. 30 | 1,416,443 | 625,883 | 146,790 | 240,000 | 2,429,116 | ........ | 2,324,973 | None | 1,058,937 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lewiston, Me. .... | 35 | 33,996,170 | Feb. 28 | 1,058,467 | None | 159,971 | None | 1,245,438 | 225,427 | 95,097 | None | 200,007† |
| Lexington, Ky. .... | 46 | 49,545,240 | Dec. 31 | 852,670 | 11,949 | 407,343 | 398,250 | 1,670,213 | 406,652 | None | 1,789,263 | 77,058† |
| Lima, Ohio ....... | 42 | 48,928,900 | Dec. 31 | 622,336 | 83,784 | 149,182 | None | 655,302 | 494,719 | 234,324 | ........ | 1,008,601 |
| Lincoln, Nebr. .... | 76 | 93,975,140 | Aug. 31 | 795,523 | None | 353,957 | None | 1,149,481 | 1,525,726 | 647,785 | 493,000 | 260,166 |
| Little Rock, Ark. .. | 82 | 39,668,127 | Dec. 31 | 397,470 | None | 290,609 | None | 688,079 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ |
| Lorain, Ohio ...... | 45 | 71,000,000 | Dec. 31 | 685,378 | None | 525,229 | None | 1,210,608 | 664,462 | 170,720 | 6,500 | 335,814 |
| Lynchburg, Va. .... | 41 | 45,171,536 | Dec. 31 | 532,427 | 111,929 | 312,628 | 349,000 | 1,305,984 | 538,200 | 254,296 | 425,000 | ........ |
| McKeesport, Pa. ... | 55 | 54,660,225 | Dec. 31 | 625,765 | None | 296,631 | None | 922,397 | 1,127,465 | 231,099 | 535,048 | 1,122,275† |
| Macon, Ga. ....... | 54 | 39,000,000 | Dec. 31 | 578,305 | 158,113 | 78,251 | None | 814,670 | ........ | ........ | 104,000 | 370,065 |
| Madison, Wis. .... | 58 | 122,339,986 | Dec. 31 | 1,949,864 | 260,364 | 434,097 | 50,000 | 2,694,326 | 1,182,621 | 550,950 | 185,241 | 387,277† |
| Manchester, N. H.. | 77 | 95,868,758 | Dec. 31 | 1,841,574 | 45,277 | 567,035 | 1,000,000 | 3,453,887 | 921,497 | 215,011 | 197,734 | 55,063† |
| Marion, Ohio ...... | 31 | 33,000,000 | ...... | 330,154 | ........ | 138,000 | ........ | 468,154 | ........ | ........ | None | 486,892 |
| Medford, Mass. .... | 60 | 81,335,450 | Dec. 31 | 1,798,659 | 52,716 | 409,034 | 2,999,289 | 5,259,697 | 1,220,785 | 223,244 | 465,000 | 1,692,476† |
| Mt. Vernon, N. Y. .. | 61 | 154,111,260 | Dec. 31 | 3,271,167 | 844,545 | 518,616 | 1,552,304 | 6,186,632 | 2,462,079 | 504,310 | 1,200,000* | 2,457,470† |
| Muncie, Ind. ...... | 47 | 39,240,505 | Dec. 31 | 358,480 | None | 25,866 | 65,000 | 449,246 | ........ | ........ | 126,000 | ........ |
| Muskogee, Okla. ... | 32 | 18,382,934 | June 30 | 198,797 | None | 311,142 | None | 509,939 | 481,685 | 60,000 | 120,000 | 389,542 |
| Newark, Ohio .... | 31 | 28,275,610 | Dec. 31 | 293,140 | 6,526 | 118,165 | None | 417,831 | ........ | 122,690 | ........ | 136,278† |
| New Britain, Conn. | 68 | 102,145,707 | Mar. 31 | 1,889,318 | 200,296 | 259,594 | 915,000 | 3,264,208 | 1,215,249 | 254,381 | None | 1,329,016† |
| New Rochelle, N. Y. | 54 | 200,952,001 | Dec. 31 | 5,149,638 | 670,189 | 378,099 | 637,225 | 6,835,153 | 1,754,515 | ........ | 446,000 | 2,500,091† |
| Niagara Falls, N. Y.. | 75 | 147,514,461 | Dec. 31 | 1,411,010 | 619,757* | 327,858 | ........ | 2,358,625 | 2,087,527 | 355,735 | 376,000 | 719,572† |
| Norristown, Pa. .... | 36 | 25,075,620 | Dec. 31 | 312,676 | None | 42,955 | 310,000 | 665,631 | ........ | ........ | 150,491* | 133,026 |
| Norwalk, Conn. .... | 36 | 63,586,000 | Dec. 31 | 826,976 | 54,167 | 14,745 | 1,050,000 | 1,945,888 | 458,023 | 605,788 | 50,000* | 705,038† |
| Oak Park, Ill. .... | 54 | 43,546,812 | Dec. 31 | 964,273 | 75,004 | 176,746 | 475,119 | 1,691,142 | ........ | 337,977 | 224,760 | 1,416,662 |
| Ogden, Utah ...... | 40 | 32,791,979 | Dec. 31 | 462,826 | None | 151,967 | None | 614,793 | 666,258 | 175,031 | 12,000 | 199,500 |
| Oshkosh, Wis. .... | 40 | 46,295,325 | Dec. 31 | 904,317 | 380,671 | 124,459 | None | 1,409,447 | 393,271 | 188,603 | None | 20,076† |
| Paducah, Ky. ..... | 34 | 18,219,269 | Dec. 31 | 304,004 | ........ | 108,443 | ........ | 412,446 | 251,694 | 205,699 | ........ | 270,395† |
| Pasadena, Calif. .... | 76 | 122,251,320 | June 30 | 1,924,271 | 153,349 | 1,288,806 | None | 3,366,427 | 3,283,338 | 2,653,795 | 3,391,242 | 425,479 |
| Pawtucket, R. I. .... | 77 | 143,358,725 | Dec. 31 | 1,993,753 | 175,867 | 227,305 | 900,000 | 3,296,925 | 823,634 | 525,474 | 721,675 | 1,612,739 |
| Pensacola, Fla. .... | 32 | 25,905,147 | Oct. 31 | 342,286 | None | 375,976 | None | 712,262 | ........ | 98,318 | 86,000* | 880,255 |
| Phoenix, Ariz. ..... | 48 | 64,396,630 | June 30 | 726,068 | ........ | 222,302 | ........ | 948,370 | 618,405 | 665,634 | ........ | 470,698 |
| Pittsfield, Mass. .... | 50 | 60,194,620 | Dec. 31 | 1,681,571 | ........ | 1,138,902 | 2,200,000 | 5,020,472 | 659,205 | ........ | ........ | 1,011,002† |
| Port Arthur, Tex. .. | 51 | 26,694,050 | Dec. 31 | 459,026 | 162,966 | 49,791 | 50,500 | 722,284 | ........ | 211,494 | None | 462,254 |
| Port Huron, Mich. . | 31 | 31,303,310 | Apr. 30 | 362,553 | ........ | 143,249 | ........ | 405,803 | 524,190 | 125,569 | ........ | 701,460† |
| Portland, Me. ..... | 71 | 90,270,375 | Dec. 31 | 3,022,908 | 72,679 | 551,147 | 2,700,000 | 6,346,735 | 843,182 | None | 222,999 | 603,959† |
| Portsmouth, Ohio .. | 43 | 49,400,000 | Dec. 31 | 188,733 | ........ | 142,673 | 30,000 | 361,407 | ........ | 228,481 | 20,000 | 383,934 |
| Portsmouth, Va. .... | 46 | 33,255,304 | Dec. 31 | 527,027 | ........ | 389,078 | 100,000 | 1,016,105 | 329,000 | 324,469 | ........ | 925,088† |
| Pueblo, Colo. ...... | 50 | 28,410,911 | Dec. 31 | 877,907 | ........ | 61,696 | ........ | 939,603 | 846,077 | 569,050 | ........ | 112,807 |
| Quincy, Ill. ....... | 39 | 33,969,380 | Dec. 31 | 394,850 | ........ | 69,785 | 206,000 | 670,635 | ........ | 267,582 | ........ | ........ |
| Quincy, Mass. .... | 71 | 127,462,700 | Dec. 31 | 2,698,594 | 421,490 | 592,664 | 4,680,000 | 8,312,748 | 1,220,289 | 380,551 | 1,509,000 | 1,821,070† |
| Racine, Wis. ...... | 68 | 103,428,206 | Dec. 31 | 1,351,119 | 120,034 | 395,467 | 510,558 | 2,377,178 | 1,263,278 | 595,950 | None | 1,743,337† |
| Raleigh, N. C. .... | 37 | 42,527,286 | Dec. 31 | 623,942 | ........ | 138,909 | 50,000 | 812,851 | ........ | 201,890 | ........ | 296,797 |
| Roanoke, Va. ..... | 69 | 68,952,359 | Dec. 31 | 1,334,053 | None | 497,998 | 450,000 | 2,282,051 | 651,448 | None | None | 1,553,728† |
| Rockford, Ill. ...... | 86 | 53,404,514 | Dec. 31 | 594,989 | 20,000 | 288,177 | 393,200 | 1,296,426 | 1,163,145 | 300,287 | None | 870,631† |
| Rome, N. Y. ...... | 32 | 29,210,727 | Dec. 31 | 438,364 | 94,499 | 134,067 | 196,500 | 863,430 | 486,497 | 134,185 | 333,000 | 70,790† |
| Sacramento, Calif. .. | 94 | 100,019,900 | Dec. 31 | 1,805,695 | ........ | 510,751 | 122,279 | 2,438,726 | ........ | 514,661 | ........ | 349,200 |
| Saginaw, Mich. .... | 81 | 84,850,692 | June 30 | 1,344,295 | 268,441 | 178,083 | 7,719 | 1,798,538 | 1,179,549 | 286,466 | None | 2,082,673† |

## TABLE IX.—RECEIPTS, ASSESSED VALUATIONS, AND DELINQUENT TAXES IN 1934 OF CITIES OVER 30,000—Continued

*See notes on page 341; † includes delinquent school taxes.

| City | Pop. 1930 (000 omitted) | Assessed Valuations | End of Fiscal Year | General Receipts (except schools, utilities, and bond proceeds) | | | | | School Receipts (except Bond Proceeds) | Utility Receipts (except Bond Proceeds) | Proceeds of Bond Sales (all Purposes) | Total Accumulated Delinquent Taxes End of Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Property Taxes & Assessments (all local purposes except Schools) | Grants and Shares from Other Governments | Other Local Revenue | Borrowing Against Current Revenue | Total General Receipts | | | | |
| ***30,000 to 100,000—continued*** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| St. Joseph, Mo. | 81 | $ 65,908,800 | Dec. 31 | $ 694,683 | $........ | $ 373,304 | $ 40,000 | $1,107,987 | $1,001,087 | $........ | $........ | $ 407,491 |
| St. Petersburg, Fla. | 40 | 84,431,339 | Oct. 30 | 1,619,378 | ........ | 259,866 | ........ | 1,879,244 | ........ | 720,066 | ........ | 2,520,556 |
| Salem, Mass. | 43 | 58,084,910 | Dec. 31 | 1,450,331 | 200,735 | 2,301,808 | 2,000,000 | 5,952,873 | 498,539 | 183,614 | 332,000 | 667,666 |
| San Bernardino, Calif. | 37 | 14,052,925 | June 30 | 284,666 | ........ | 149,194 | ........ | 433,859 | 864,105 | 197,417 | None | ........ |
| San Jose, Calif. | 58 | 42,039,565 | Dec. 31 | 651,165 | ........ | 133,179 | ........ | 784,344 | 1,385,409 | ........ | 375,000 | 61,043 |
| Santa Ana, Calif. | 30 | 15,968,815 | Dec. 31 | 605,702 | ........ | 130,783 | ........ | 736,485 | 917,770 | 139,687 | ........ | 82,346 |
| Santa Barbara, Calif. | 34 | 43,165,140 | Dec. 31 | 702,455 | ........ | 141,211 | ........ | 843,666 | 693,088* | 221,108 | None | 113,352 |
| Santa Monica, Calif. | 37 | 39,257,780 | June 30 | 856,210 | None | 252,307 | None | 1,108,516 | 1,157,198 | 430,348* | None | 280,785 |
| Savannah, Ga. | 85 | 61,136,096 | Dec. 31 | 1,297,843 | ........ | 713,859 | 120,000 | 2,131,702 | 605,846 | ........ | ........ | 450,034 |
| Sheboygan, Wis. | 39 | 46,200,110 | Dec. 31 | 648,899 | 634,708 | 392,058 | None | 1,165,667 | 541,542 | 197,308 | None | 158,322 |
| Sioux City, Iowa | 79 | 94,747,106 | Mar. 31 | 1,001,199 | ........ | 256,932 | None | 1,258,132 | ........ | 300,348 | 51,800* | 146,354 |
| Sioux Falls, S. D. | 33 | 40,420,689 | Dec. 31 | 519,200 | ........ | 242,884 | None | 762,082 | 673,472 | 315,070 | 125,000 | 56,255 |
| Springfield, Mo. | 58 | 37,624,667 | June 30 | 492,510 | None | 204,995 | 40,000 | 737,505 | 665,063 | None | 753,000 | 252,343 |
| Springfield, Ohio | 69 | 77,163,780 | Dec. 31 | 834,078 | 143,700 | 339,435 | None | 1,317,215 | ........ | 290,266 | 623,936 | ........ |
| Stamford, Conn. | 46 | 109,706,614 | Dec. 31 | 1,021,380 | ........ | 109,664 | 700,000 | 1,831,044 | 887,309 | ........ | ........ | 832,654 |
| Steubenville, Ohio | 35 | 49,705,500 | Dec. 31 | 304,204 | 141,585 | 35,945 | 147,450 | 629,184 | 567,045 | 119,205 | 173,025 | 189,702 |
| Stockton, Calif. | 48 | 63,856,817 | Dec. 31 | 1,210,861 | ........ | 234,852 | 100,000 | 1,545,713 | ........ | ........ | ........ | 239,081 |
| Superior, Wis. | 36 | 44,469,745 | Dec. 31 | 214,945 | 420,030 | 152,663 | None | 787,640 | 893,232 | None | 265,000 | 615,604† |
| Topeka, Kans. | 64 | 69,426,152 | June 30 | 1,424,609 | 6,996 | 122,122 | ........ | 1,553,728 | 1,331,085 | 407,584 | 47,890 | ........ |
| Troy, N. Y. | 73 | 74,879,417 | Dec. 31 | 2,721,365 | 420,951 | 351,577 | 638,334 | 4,132,227 | 919,413 | 380,493 | 832,813 | 920,627† |
| Tucson, Ariz. | 33 | 19,595,570 | June 30 | 677,820 | ........ | 104,067 | ........ | 781,887 | 433,921 | 260,151 | None | 124,250 |
| Waco, Tex. | 53 | 52,473,850 | Sept. 30 | 889,509 | None | 115,340 | None | 1,004,850 | 335,624 | 268,555 | None | 743,469† |
| Waltham, Mass. | 39 | 58,025,285 | Dec. 31 | 1,000,612 | 257,129 | 506,000 | 2,155,254 | 3,918,995 | 624,836 | 129,102 | 107,000 | 751,352 |
| Warren, Ohio | 41 | 49,031,749 | Dec. 31 | 356,000 | ........ | 164,000 | None | 520,000 | 817,222 | 210,000 | 120,000* | ........ |
| Waterbury, Conn. | 100 | 162,479,841 | Dec. 31 | 3,999,213 | 61,089 | 227,272 | 3,000,000 | 7,287,572 | 1,752,368 | 588,896 | 570,000 | 2,818,568† |
| Waterloo, Iowa | 46 | 29,543,123 | Mar. 31 | 411,853 | None | 87,595 | None | 499,449 | 587,242 | 152,784 | None | 104,616 |
| Watertown, Mass. | 35 | 53,168,110 | Dec. 31 | 1,272,852 | 198,005 | 207,122 | 1,265,000 | 2,942,979 | 720,285 | 188,546 | 199,000 | 618,582† |
| Watertown, N. Y. | 32 | 48,134,123 | June 30 | 620,926 | 269,946 | 485,779 | 276,000 | 1,652,652 | 741,982 | 358,994 | 335,000* | ........ |
| Waukegan, Ill. | 33 | 18,664,350 | Dec. 31 | 78,000 | None | 75,000 | 72,000 | 225,000 | ........ | 186,000 | None | ........ |
| West Allis, Wis. | 35 | 50,026,798 | Dec. 31 | 352,137 | 141,249 | 60,917 | 100,000 | 654,304 | 632,859 | 115,446 | None | 468,133† |
| Wheeling, W. Va. | 62 | 110,912,800 | June 30 | 462,144 | ........ | 27,459 | ........ | 489,602 | 914,441 | 336,260 | ........ | 91,695 |
| Wichita Falls, Tex. | 44 | 30,675,830 | Mar. 31 | 357,032 | None | 47,290 | None | 404,322 | 533,083 | 206,174 | None | 531,949 |
| Williamsport, Pa. | 46 | 29,190,345 | Dec. 31 | 569,388 | ........ | 93,626 | 74,833 | 737,847 | ........ | None | 115,420 | 270,423 |
| Winston-Salem, N. C. | 75 | 101,163,080 | June 30 | 1,681,775 | ........ | 1,241,417 | 600,000 | 3,523,192 | None | 374,108 | ........ | 328,535† |
| York, Pa. | 55 | 48,600 | Dec. 31 | 484,000 | None | 148,000 | None | 32,000 | ........ | ........ | None | 142,750 |

## EXPENDITURES IN 1934 (OR LAST FISCAL YEAR) OF 222 CITIES OVER 30,000

Cities are arranged alphabetically by population groups; those not reporting are listed on page 341. An asterisk (*) refers to notes on page 342.

| City | Pop. 1930 (000 omitted) | General Expenditures (except schools, utilities, and bond proceeds) | | | | | | School Expenditures (except bonds) | Utility Expenditures (except bonds) | Expenditures from Proceeds of Bonds |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Welfare and Relief (from current revenue) | Current Operation and Maintenance | Debt Service (interest and bond principal) | Capital Outlays (from current revenues) | Repayment Current Borrowing | Total General Expenditures | | | |
| ***Over 500,000*** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baltimore, Md. | 805 | $ ........ | $ 22,096,303 | $ 7,313,886 | $........ | $ ........ | $ 29,410,189 | $ 10,765,979 | $ 3,140,388 | $ 3,445,700 |
| Boston, Mass. | 781 | 14,250,064 | 41,490,946 | 13,635,985 | None | 45,487,600 | 114,864,595 | 16,286,709 | 7,435,601 | 5,138,383 |
| Buffalo, N. Y. | 573 | 8,319,185 | 14,119,309 | 3,477,178 | 63,351 | None | 25,979,024 | 11,692,095 | 2,227,861 | 3,663,259 |
| Chicago, Ill. | 3,376 | ........ | 50,655,624* | 2,353,845 | ........ | 24,236,000 | 77,245,469 | 68,073,927 | 14,211,256 | 22,588,155* |
| Cleveland, Ohio | 900 | 150,000 | 15,240,860 | 14,041,922 | 294,750 | 450,000 | 30,147,532 | 13,303,369 | 7,670,417 | 3,663,042 |
| Detroit, Mich. | 1,569 | 12,122,766 | 40,036,937 | 8,466,898 | ........ | 2,822,500* | 64,449,101 | 20,683,082 | 20,822,753 | ........ |
| Los Angeles, Calif. | 1,238 | 487,560 | 25,418,616 | 14,340,809 | ........ | None | 40,246,985 | 18,016,972 | 20,787,608 | 11,490,748 |
| Milwaukee, Wis. | 578 | 41,428 | 11,875,615 | 6,017,326 | 98,251 | ........ | 18,032,622 | 9,055,770 | 1,197,153 | 589,617 |
| New York, N. Y. | 6,930 | 204,295,265 | 220,360,119 | 203,688,412 | 9,858,747 | 404,463,352* | 1,042,625,895 | 153,067,182 | 77,328,944 | 47,884,086 |
| Philadelphia, Pa. | 1,951 | 374,000 | 46,102,646 | 20,156,402 | 374,243 | 7,050,000 | 74,057,291 | 40,005,423 | 13,193,096 | 4,248,811 |
| Pittsburgh, Pa. | 670 | 944,867 | 13,975,312 | 6,138,755 | None | 750,000 | 21,808,935 | ........ | 1,278,520 | 3,067,398 |
| St. Louis, Mo. | 882 | ........ | 19,321,449 | 6,815,152 | ........ | ........ | 26,136,591 | 10,175,886 | 4,021,409 | 7,281,310 |
| San Francisco, Calif. | 634 | 4,711,559 | 18,675,489 | 12,594,932 | 1,666,862 | 6,150,000 | 43,798,844 | 7,765,248 | 5,190,487 | 6,248,184 |
| ***200,000 to 500,000*** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Atlanta, Ga. | 270 | 579,714 | 4,476,736 | 599,509 | 17,656 | 1,240,892 | 6,914,505 | 3,306,709 | 689,068 | 17,112 |
| Birmingham, Ala. | 260 | None | 2,114,069 | 1,242,340 | 124,805 | None | 3,481,214 | 2,073,116 | None | None |
| Cincinnati, Ohio | 451 | 123,591 | 8,363,337 | 8,330,342 | 305,254 | 135,000 | 17,257,524 | 8,216,857 | 3,174,588 | 3,210,061* |
| Columbus, Ohio | 291 | 81,232 | 3,402,925 | 3,830,977 | 64,020 | 616,900 | 7,996,055 | ........ | 1,307,268 | ........ |
| Dallas, Texas | 260 | 32,473 | 2,831,267 | 1,774,403 | 49,760 | None | 4,687,903 | 3,623,109 | 1,386,068 | 902,082 |
| Dayton, Ohio | 201 | 73,245 | 1,651,802 | 2,173,186 | 5,862 | 90,000 | 3,994,095 | 3,507,765 | 804,906 | ........ |
| Denver, Colo. | 288 | 288,494 | 6,635,796 | 255,203 | 32,216 | None | 7,111,711 | 5,225,097 | 2,273,846 | 997,612 |
| Kansas City, Mo. | 400 | 165,636 | 6,182,062 | 1,115,392 | ........ | 750,000 | 8,213,089 | 4,634,740 | 2,316,022 | 1,645,584 |
| Louisville, Ky. | 308 | 643,061 | 4,851,179 | 713,062 | ........ | 1,000,000 | 7,207,303 | 2,672,252 | 796,968 | 250,000 |
| Minneapolis, Minn. | 464 | 1,179,874 | 8,557,901 | 7,572,354 | ........ | 150,000 | 17,460,129 | 8,585,558 | 1,408,324 | 4,751,567* |
| Newark, N. J. | 442 | 233,735 | 12,120,006 | 6,347,875 | 700,000 | 37,751,700 | 56,453,316 | 9,443,599 | 2,541,366 | 11,296,000 |
| Oakland, Calif. | 284 | 21,667 | 4,316,259 | 1,057,078 | 579,410 | None | 5,974,414 | 5,353,851 | 402,133* | 106,518 |
| Omaha, Nebr. | 214 | ........ | 2,430,781 | 1,503,379 | ........ | ........ | 3,934,160 | 3,327,806 | ........ | ........ |
| Portland, Ore. | 302 | 82,312 | 3,677,548 | 4,149,606 | 134,905 | 4,090,075 | 12,134,446 | 3,430,966 | 1,787,580 | 1,700,849 |
| Providence, R. I. | 253 | 542,095 | 8,291,816 | 1,925,573 | ........ | 2,283,000 | 13,042,484 | 4,875,318 | 1,764,520 | 2,076,738 |
| Rochester, N. Y. | 328 | 4,803,538 | 7,970,626 | 6,585,243 | ........ | 1,350,000 | 20,709,408 | 8,413,923 | 1,323,897 | 5,221,341 |

## Table X.—Expenditures in 1934 of Cities Over 30,000—Continued

An asterisk refers to notes on page 342.

| City | Pop. 1930 (000 omitted) | General Expenditures (except schools, utilities, and bond proceeds) | | | | | | School Expenditures (except bonds) | Utility Expenditures (except bonds) | Expenditures from Proceeds of Bonds |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Welfare and Relief (from current revenue) | Current Operation and Maintenance | Debt Service (interest and bond principal) | Capital Outlays (from current revenues) | Repayment Current Borrowing | Total General Expenditures | | | |
| ***200,000 to 500,000—continued*** | | | | | | | | | | |
| St. Paul, Minn. | 212 | $ 198,408 | $ 4,355,704 | $1,971,028 | $ 5,000 | $ 178,521 | $ 6,708,661 | $2,964,162 | $1,178,925 | $1,483,919 |
| San Antonio, Tex. | 232 | None | 1,531,937 | 1,515,256 | 6,213 | 1,470,800 | 4,524,207 | 4,124,933 | 991,825 | None |
| Syracuse, N. Y.* | 209 | 4,283,299 | 6,985,411 | 2,585,113 | 82,512 | 700,000 | 14,636,335 | 3,936,807 | 814,167 | ........ |
| Washington, D. C. | 487 | 10,546,457 | 13,581,911 | None | 3,191,712 | None | 27,320,078 | 9,801,484 | 1,675,984 | None |
| ***100,000 to 200,000*** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Albany, N. Y. | 127 | 276,000 | 3,449,120 | 1,373,695 | None | 2,450,000 | 7,548,815 | 2,471,329 | 1,154,573 | 1,228,190 |
| Camden, N. J. | 119 | ........ | 1,797,786 | 1,658,579 | ........ | ........ | 3,456,365 | 1,500,999 | 351,943 | ........ |
| Canton, Ohio | 105 | 54,397 | 720,224* | ........* | ........ | ........ | 774,622 | ........ | 333,544 | 61,775 |
| Chattanooga, Tenn.* | 120 | 52,419 | 1,672,289 | 1,017,930 | 2,998 | 497,766 | 3,243,402 | 1,018,883 | ........ | ........ |
| Des Moines, Iowa | 143 | ........ | 2,201,846 | 666,054 | ........ | ........ | 2,867,900 | 2,927,401 | 863,713 | 798,011 |
| Duluth, Minn. | 101 | ........ | 1,343,196 | 653,930 | ........ | 345,000 | 2,342,126 | ........ | 1,145,251 | 274,699 |
| Elizabeth, N. J. | 115 | 140,000 | 1,966,478 | 993,707 | ........ | 2,300,000 | 5,400,186 | 2,269,838 | 1,695,000 | 4,800,000 |
| El Paso, Tex. | 102 | 29,460 | 1,294,451 | 1,073,927 | None | ........ | 2,397,839 | 776,101 | 551,983 | 40,294 |
| Erie, Pa. | 116 | 23,695 | 1,150,133 | 705,696 | None | 390,000 | 2,269,524 | 2,558,794 | 812,564 | 145,849 |
| Evansville, Ind. | 102 | 11,944 | 1,193,347 | 119,633 | None | None | 1,324,925 | 1,231,696 | 502,074 | None |
| Fall River, Mass. | 115 | 1,142,758 | 2,031,372 | 1,324,307 | ........ | 3,677,055 | 8,175,492 | 1,521,399 | 389,719 | 20,183 |
| Flint, Mich. | 156 | 40,262 | 930,054 | 687,423 | 22,833 | 41,593 | 1,722,167 | 2,978,031 | 718,414 | 7,293 |
| Fort Wayne, Ind. | 115 | 15,000 | 1,066,770 | 108,463 | ........ | ........ | 1,190,233 | ........ | 1,523,562 | None |
| Fort Worth, Tex. | 163 | 171,739 | 1,778,939 | 1,014,460 | 64,771 | 1,351,639 | 4,381,520 | 2,326,665 | 842,438 | 58,562 |
| Gary, Ind. | 100 | None | 1,246,290 | 233,251 | None | 362,843 | 1,843,014 | 1,258,280 | None | None |
| Grand Rapids, Mich. | 169 | 779,559 | 1,848,273 | 476,778 | None | None | 3,104,601 | 3,277,217 | 535,852 | 49,001 |
| Hartford, Conn. | 164 | 1,972,973 | 3,745,550 | 883,166 | ........ | 1,342,400 | 7,944,089 | ........ | 959,804 | 3,057,600* |
| Jacksonville, Fla. | 130 | 125,382 | 2,372,302 | 949,203 | 58,040 | 125,000 | 3,629,927 | ........ | 1,875,019 | ........ |
| Knoxville, Tenn. | 106 | 157,655 | 1,124,064 | 1,278,137 | ........ | 2,609,677 | 5,169,533 | 988,388 | 495,896 | 37,557 |
| Long Beach, Calif. | 142 | 33,200 | 2,966,785 | 1,381,303 | 30,800 | None | 4,412,088 | ........ | 1,672,880 | 15,600 |
| Lowell, Mass. | 100 | 1,087,374 | 2,316,856 | 919,504 | ........ | 3,249,960 | 7,573,694 | 1,268,148 | 332,269 | 250,412 |
| Lynn, Mass. | 102 | 1,082,721 | 2,366,248 | 1,143,961 | 112,100 | 4,851,215 | 9,556,245 | 1,475,472 | 192,381 | 124,664 |
| Miami, Fla. | 111 | 294,985 | 1,799,834 | 2,934,186 | 111,214 | None | 5,140,219 | 1,134,860 | 444,988 | 81,832 |
| New Haven, Conn. | 163 | 1,545,951 | 3,630,100 | 1,721,045 | None | 573,730 | 7,470,829 | 2,602,470 | None | 145,190 |
| Norfolk, Va. | 130 | 337,624 | 1,738,850 | 2,071,686 | ........ | 1,230,000 | 5,378,161 | 1,488,323 | 803,597 | 26,993* |
| Oklahoma City, Okla. | 185 | 166,421 | 1,567,909 | 1,281,278 | 37,942 | None | 3,053,551 | 3,304,532 | 757,140 | 7,544 |
| Reading, Pa. | 111 | 15,474 | 1,376,186 | 190,514 | 22,670 | 350,000 | 1,954,844 | 2,828,605 | 406,198 | 375,827 |
| Salt Lake City, Utah | 140 | ........ | 2,273,184 | 337,713 | ........ | 1,451,700 | 4,062,597 | 2,233,225 | 705,894 | 425,000* |
| Scranton, Pa. | 143 | 13,075 | 1,825,757 | 360,499 | ........ | 300,000 | 2,499,331 | 2,751,628 | ........ | 785,797 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 104 | None | 911,709 | 74,000 | None | None | 985,708 | ........ | 414,547 | None |
| Spokane, Wash. ...... | 116 | 7,975 | 1,355,984 | 425,943 | 86,612 | None | 1,876,514 | 1,391,611 | 758,834 | 150,000 |
| Springfield, Mass. ..... | 150 | 2,426,105 | 4,523,205 | 1,278,902 | 111,969 | 8,217,315 | 16,557,223 | 3,677,627 | 989,063 | 1,081,337 |
| Tacoma, Wash. ...... | 107 | 47,166 | 1,227,047 | 307,164 | 80,826 | 891,980 | 2,554,184 | 1,357,747 | 2,645,291 | 166,745 |
| Tampa, Fla. ........ | 101 | 36,762 | 1,387,317 | 683,572 | 53,511 | 345,000 | 2,506,162 | ........ | 482,451 | ........ |
| Trenton, N. J. ...... | 123 | 168,204 | 2,382,329 | 1,644,306 | ........ | ........ | 4,194,839 | 1,880,884 | 555,558 | 224,161* |
| Wichita, Kans. ...... | 111 | 20,882 | 1,003,565 | 734,429 | ........ | None | 1,758,878 | 2,790,019 | ........ | 193,192 |
| Wilmington, Del. .... | 107 | 5,338 | 316,384 | 804,222 | ........ | 70,000 | 1,195,944 | ........ | 519,222 | ........ |
| Worcester, Mass. ...... | 195 | 2,056,118 | 6,560,721 | 2,072,200 | ........ | 6,680,000 | 17,369,039 | 3,261,000 | 485,152 | 1,573,965 |

### *30,000 to 100,000*

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alameda, Calif. ...... | 35 | 47,393 | 555,713 | 36,367 | 74,124 | ........ | 713,597 | 758,021 | 394,702 | ........ |
| Allentown, Pa. ....... | 93 | None | 957,756 | 393,665 | 166,000 | 165,000 | 1,682,421 | 2,094,506 | 191,031 | 454,242 |
| Alton, Ill. .......... | 30 | 19,000 | 172,000 | 44,000 | None | 155,100 | 390,100 | ........ | None | None |
| Altoona, Pa. ........ | 82 | 28,766 | 552,011 | 159,543 | ........ | 350,000 | 1,090,321 | 1,435,815 | 246,380 | ........* |
| Amarillo, Tex. ...... | 43 | 7,500 | 330,340 | 210,245 | 9,035 | 518,024 | 1,075,185 | 606,667 | 222,013 | None |
| Arlington, Mass. ...... | 36 | 278,226 | 873,875 | 144,621 | 187,655 | 1,300,000 | 2,784,376 | 784,457 | 222,260 | None |
| Asheville, N. C. ...... | 50 | 31,114 | 623,703* | 559,867* | None | None | 1,214,684 | None | ........* | None |
| Auburn, N. Y. ........ | 37 | 458,379 | 534,336 | 345,862 | ........ | 80,000 | 1,418,577 | 575,952 | 192,124 | 271,924 |
| Austin, Tex. ........ | 53 | 78,513 | 620,331 | 446,604 | 39,642 | None | 1,185,092 | 503,996 | 1,010,331 | 11,887 |
| Bay City, Mich. ...... | 47 | None | 480,864 | 255,625 | None | 404,708 | 1,141,197 | 796,869 | 468,059 | None |
| Beaumont, Tex. ...... | 58 | None | 406,933 | 476,358 | 18,873 | 222,500 | 1,124,664 | 531,679 | 366,217 | 132,913 |
| Bellingham, Wash. .... | 31 | None | 257,514 | 50,900 | 10,295 | None | 318,710 | ........ | 171,920 | None |
| Berkeley, Calif. ...... | 82 | 11,057 | 1,205,001 | 160,589 | 18,842 | None | 1,395,491 | 1,773,819 | 1,008,264* | 13,878 |
| Berwyn, Ill. ......... | 47 | 12,652 | 688,173 | 6,396 | ........ | ........ | 707,220 | ........ | ........ | 141,000* |
| Bethlehem, Pa. ...... | 58 | ........ | 293,597 | 352,960 | 99,650 | 205,000 | 951,207 | ........ | 257,853 | ........ |
| Binghamton, N. Y. .... | 77 | 284,054 | 3,052,403 | 854,937 | 28,188 | 172,700 | 4,392,284 | 1,418,600 | 178,097 | 1,080,517 |
| Bloomfield, N. J. ...... | 38 | 38,642 | 627,768 | 573,615 | None | 1,625,000 | 2,865,024 | ........ | 240,266 | 45,000* |
| Brookline, Mass. ...... | 47 | 310,485 | 2,657,354 | 199,688 | 48,315 | 1,600,000 | 4,815,842 | 1,102,335 | 279,109 | 73,294 |
| Charleston, W. Va. .... | 60 | None | 440,941 | 54,404 | ........ | ........ | 495,346 | ........ | ........ | ........ |
| Charlotte, N. C. ...... | 83 | 27,627 | 1,036,446 | 873,353 | 25,975 | 415,125 | 2,378,526 | 407,770 | 342,842 | 155,522 |
| Chelsea, Mass. ........ | 46 | 744,684 | 988,427 | 210,834 | 19,800 | 1,712,965 | 3,676,713 | 640,224 | 184,103 | 32,485 |
| Chester, Pa. ......... | 59 | None | 550,866 | 306,062 | None | 75,000 | 781,928 | ........ | None | 37,485 |
| Chicopee, Mass. ...... | 44 | 448,770 | 1,257,315 | 367,143 | None | 430,000 | 2,503,228 | 493,978 | 490,021 | None |
| Cleveland Hgts., Ohio.. | 51 | 38,290 | 521,076 | 1,324,486 | None | None | 1,883,853 | ........ | 411,525 | 37,900 |
| Clifton, N. J. ........ | 47 | 36,119 | 513,502 | 501,058 | ........ | 93,626 | 1,050,678 | 633,051 | 72,835* | 555,681 |
| Colorado Spgs., Colo. .. | 33 | 73,762 | 385,620 | 91,600 | 36,393 | None | 587,376 | 731,374 | 812,825 | 350,000 |
| Columbus, Ga. ....... | 43 | 79,010 | 417,456 | 282,574 | None | None | 779,040 | 269,587 | 110,793 | None |
| Council Bluffs, Iowa .. | 42 | 8,481 | 336,481 | 155,011 | 58,952 | 56,000 | 614,927 | 647,304 | 273,682 | None |
| Cumberland, Md. .... | 38 | ........ | 373,966 | 138,325 | ........ | 505,476 | 1,017,787 | ........ | 261,683 | 57,103 |
| Danville, Ill. ......... | 36 | ........ | 284,331 | 33,350 | ........ | 88,000 | 405,681 | ........ | None | None |
| Dearborn, Mich. ...... | 50 | 119,987 | 1,168,591 | 960,619 | 22,817 | 22,400 | 2,294,415 | ........ | 242,747 | ........ |
| Decatur, Ill. ......... | 58 | 1,643 | 425,951 | 27,096 | ........ | 214,900 | 669,585 | 1,563,631 | 185,860 | 284,702 |
| Dubuque, Iowa ...... | 42 | ........ | 553,157 | 181,966 | 137,220 | ........ | 872,344 | 518,186 | 187,957 | 12,187 |
| Durham, N. C. ...... | 52 | 49,381 | 495,261 | 895,049 | 15,355 | 341,000 | 1,796,046 | 513,858 | 421,193 | 484,776 |
| East Chicago, Ind. .... | 55 | None | 548,098 | 57,577 | None | 214,200 | 819,876 | ........ | 307,931 | None |

## TABLE X.—EXPENDITURES IN 1934 OF CITIES OVER 30,000—Continued

An asterisk refers to notes on page 342.

| City | Pop. 1930 (000 omitted) | General Expenditures (except schools, utilities, and bond proceeds): Welfare and Relief (from current revenue) | Current Operation and Maintenance | Debt Service (interest and bond principal) | Capital Outlays (from current revenues) | Repayment Current Borrowing | Total General Expenditures | School Expenditures (except bonds) | Utility Expenditures (except bonds) | Expenditures from Proceeds of Bonds |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***30,000 to 100,000—continued*** | | | | | | | | | | |
| East Cleveland, Ohio .. | 40 | $ 40,528 | $ 401,975 | $ 260,440 | $ None | $ None | $ 702,943 | $1,365,912 | $ 154,714 | $ None |
| Easton, Pa. .......... | 34 | 5,000 | 445,328 | 254,776 | 18,842 | 570,000 | 1,293,946 | ........ | ........ | 508,000 |
| East Orange, N. J. .... | 68 | 102,636 | 3,495,696 | 1,062,475 | ........ | 3,004,250 | 7,665,057 | 1,462,154 | 361,411 | 260,616 |
| Elgin, Ill. ............ | 36 | 14,959 | 229,340 | 55,664 | 46,524 | 193,000 | 538,486 | ........ | 97,314 | 73,822 |
| Elkhart, Ind. ........ | 33 | ........ | 424,572 | 23,966 | ........ | ........ | 448,538 | 338,680 | 138,534 | None |
| Elmira, N. Y. ........ | 47 | 1,135,122 | 676,290 | 236,475 | ........ | 1,000,000 | 3,047,898 | 814,591 | 400,184 | 5,361 |
| Evanston, Ill. ........ | 63 | 3,796 | 998,548 | 222,754 | ........ | 1,227,128 | 2,452,227 | ........ | 158,388 | 80,078 |
| Fitchburg, Mass. ...... | 41 | 511,872 | 919,130 | 256,700 | 216,783 | 1,965,000 | 3,869,486 | 478,646 | 66,013 | 180,000 |
| Fort Smith, Ark. ...... | 31 | 29,796 | 177,199 | 73,120 | None | None | 280,115 | 329,566 | 199,732 | None |
| Fresno, Calif. ........ | 53 | ........ | 1,021,329 | 55,288 | ........ | 300,000 | 1,076,617 | 1,463,694 | 323,689 | None |
| Galveston, Tex. ...... | 53 | ........ | 853,402 | 844,279 | 9,009 | None | 1,760,670 | ........ | 98,476 | 11,905 |
| Glendale, Calif. ...... | 63 | 146,424 | 904,908 | 142,261 | 18,811 | None | 1,212,406 | ........ | 963,941 | None |
| Green Bay, Wis. ...... | 37 | 130,901 | 635,481 | 280,804 | 40,736 | 113,493 | 1,201,415 | 771,733 | ........ | ........ |
| Greensboro, N. C. .... | 54 | 42,952 | 541,875 | 514,520 | 5,657 | ........ | 1,105,004 | 423,217 | 212,372 | None |
| Hagerstown, Md. .... | 31 | ........ | 265,114 | 151,220 | 67,278 | ........ | 483,612 | ........ | 322,157 | ........ |
| Hamilton, Ohio ...... | 52 | 130,271 | 413,553 | 467,789 | ........ | 25,000 | 1,036,614 | ........ | 899,620 | 551,216 |
| Hammond, Ind. ...... | 65 | ........ | 712,004 | 79,605 | ........ | 165,000 | 956,609 | 858,000 | 237,068 | ........ |
| Hamtramck, Mich. .... | 56 | 239,892 | 1,120,734 | 176,814 | ........ | 324,209 | 1,861,651 | 919,311 | ........ | None |
| Harrisburg, Pa. ...... | 80 | ........ | 1,193,965 | 281,800 | ........ | 150,279 | 1,626,040 | 1,909,409 | 160,074 | ........ |
| Haverhill, Mass. ...... | 49 | 1,025,462 | 864,960 | 287,898 | 15,300 | 1,689,000 | 3,882,521 | 543,991 | 178,427 | 80,677 |
| Highland Park, Mich.. . | 53 | 116,283 | 1,019,739 | 163,778 | ........ | ........ | 1,349,800 | 1,480,880 | 211,114 | 205,000* |
| High Point, N. C. .... | 37 | 27,183 | 369,714 | 147,916 | 21,442 | None | 566,255 | 53,345 | 341,201 | None |
| Hoboken, N. J. ...... | 59 | 41,000 | 4,324,411* | 431,990* | ........ | 110,000* | 4,907,400* | ........* | None | None |
| Huntington, W. Va. .. | 76 | 15,571 | 420,640 | 127,505 | ........ | ........ | 563,716 | ........ | ........ | ........ |
| Irvington, N. J. ...... | 57 | 24,300 | 796,553 | 947,468 | None | 3,310,771 | 5,079,092 | 477,583 | ........ | None |
| Jackson, Mich. ...... | 55 | 86,653 | 656,455 | 135,462 | None | 172,784 | 1,051,355 | 947,955 | 120,003 | None |
| Jackson, Miss. ........ | 48 | None | 385,428 | 689,961 | 11,395 | None | 1,086,784 | 270,554 | 70,594 | None |
| Kalamazoo, Mich. .... | 55 | 94,314 | 709,488 | 79,029 | 78,036 | None | 960,869 | 1,798,323 | 210,058 | None |
| Kenosha, Wis. ....... | 50 | 32,789 | 825,537 | 420,258 | 104,028 | ........ | 1,382,613 | 776,409 | 175,087 | 11,839 |
| Kokomo, Ind. ....... | 33 | ........ | 247,534 | 4,837 | ........ | ........ | 252,372 | 356,176 | None | None |
| La Crosse, Wis. ...... | 40 | 23,763 | 582,757 | 112,179 | 21,728 | ........ | 740,428 | 562,531 | 79,095 | ........ |
| Lakewood, Ohio ...... | 71 | 67,209 | 596,445 | 468,507 | 1,368 | 50,000 | 1,183,530 | ........ | ........ | 2,958 |
| Lancaster, Pa. ........ | 60 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | 844,839 | ........ | ........ | 595,000* |
| Lansing, Mich. ....... | 78 | 657,123 | 837,876 | 336,026 | 18,141 | 258,691 | 2,107,858 | ........ | 2,314,627 | 31,655 |
| Lewiston, Me. ........ | 35 | 234,819 | 853,600 | 152,830 | None | None | 1,241,250 | 219,340 | 37,869 | None |
| Lexington, Ky. ...... | 46 | 125,320 | 885,950 | 308,324 | 12,076 | 345,000 | 1,676,672 | 406,652 | None | 996,672 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lima, Ohio | 42 | None | 276,978 | 562,379 | None | None | 839,357 | 497,791 | 231,407 | None |
| Lincoln, Nebr. | 76 | 9,591 | 926,150 | 266,187 | 63,707 | None | 1,265,637 | 1,326,778 | 599,174 | 176,828 |
| Little Rock, Ark. | 82 | 53,853 | 448,161 | 128,914 | ........ | ........ | 631,028 | ........ | ........ | ........ |
| Lorain, Ohio | 45 | None | 658,005 | 747,222 | None | None | 1,405,228 | 771,124 | 170,720 | None |
| Lynchburg, Va. | 41 | 134,883 | 564,895 | 188,597 | 136,570 | 369,000 | 1,393,946 | 512,584 | 216,757 | 431,869 |
| McKeesport, Pa. | 55 | None | 766,196 | 189,720 | 13,706 | None | 969,624 | 998,230 | 134,085 | 529,523 |
| Macon, Ga. | 54 | 91,380 | 591,734 | 173,142 | None | None | 856,257 | ........ | ........ | ........ |
| Madison, Wis. | 58 | None | 1,094,786 | 1,447,854 | 21,671 | None | 2,564,311 | 1,204,713 | 484,114 | 144,376 |
| Manchester, N. H. | 77 | 64,440 | 1,793,527 | 618,155 | None | 1,012,327 | 3,488,449 | 921,497 | 236,757 | 294,675 |
| Marion, Ohio | 31 | None | 298,283 | 167,500 | 4,467 | None | 470,240 | ........ | ........ | None |
| Medford, Mass. | 60 | 427,170 | 1,593,023 | 434,860 | None | 2,694,289 | 5,149,342 | 1,220,786 | 235,420 | 145,275 |
| Mt. Vernon, N. Y. | 61 | ........ | 2,730,879* | 1,178,070 | ........ | 2,155,849 | 6,064,798 | 2,462,809 | 458,744 | 1,086,550* |
| Muncie, Ind. | 47 | None | 339,162 | 45,183 | None | 65,000 | 449,356 | ........ | ........ | 126,000 |
| Muskogee, Okla. | 32 | 25,000 | 278,750 | 288,059 | None | None | 591,809 | 357,135 | 60,000 | None |
| Newark, Ohio | 31 | 5,274 | 305,619 | 240,081 | 10,547 | 7,000 | 568,521 | None | 74,355 | None |
| New Britain, Conn. | 68 | 735,402 | 849,489 | 292,384 | 10,788 | 1,520,000 | 3,408,063 | 1,215,249 | 248,098 | 2,031 |
| New Rochelle, N. Y. | 54 | 995,499 | 2,812,697 | 1,681,845 | ........ | 1,460,665 | 6,950,707 | 1,754,515 | ........ | 376,415 |
| Niagara Falls, N. Y. | 75 | 949,012 | 1,445,198 | 353,241 | 20,736 | 325,552 | 3,093,739 | 1,863,023 | 370,183 | 169,313 |
| Norristown, Pa. | 36 | 5,220 | 260,286 | 119,866 | ........ | 360,000 | 745,372* | ........ | ........ | 41,770* |
| Norwalk, Conn. | 36 | 173,178 | 487,731 | 224,516 | None | 873,500 | 1,758,926 | 458,023 | 559,862 | 50,000* |
| Oak Park, Ill. | 54 | 4,214 | 678,443 | 461,565 | ........ | 540,936 | 1,685,157 | ........ | 246,169 | 224,760 |
| Ogden, Utah | 40 | None | 361,287 | 240,918 | None | None | 602,206 | 659,743 | 59,336 | 13,606 |
| Oshkosh, Wis. | 40 | 528,942 | 705,835 | 161,343 | 72,708 | None | 1,468,828 | 403,597 | 111,794 | None |
| Paducah, Ky. | 44 | 46,220 | 282,922 | 92,152 | ........ | 16,500 | 437,794 | 251,694 | 184,880 | ........ |
| Pasadena, Calif. | 76 | 21,784 | 2,041,223 | 697,067 | 78,094 | None | 2,838,170 | 3,126,551 | 3,373,821 | 2,750,085 |
| Pawtucket, R. I. | 77 | 134,071 | 937,054 | 1,217,492 | ........ | 900,000 | 3,188,617 | 823,634 | 376,107 | 410,237 |
| Pensacola, Fla. | 32 | None | 365,552 | 209,421 | 16,765 | None | 591,738 | ........ | 76,942 | 86,000* |
| Phoenix, Ariz. | 48 | 50,000 | 678,397 | 284,550 | 13,564 | ........ | 1,026,511 | 537,753 | 600,126 | ........ |
| Pittsfield, Mass. | 50 | 592,246 | 1,712,785 | 490,000 | ........ | 2,000,000 | 4,795,031 | 659,206 | ........ | ........ |
| Port Arthur, Tex. | 51 | 3,881 | 184,892 | 517,212 | 13,460 | 50,500 | 569,947 | ........ | 146,024 | None |
| Port Huron, Mich. | 31 | ........ | 403,577 | 318,124 | ........ | ........ | 721,702 | 507,534 | 86,193 | ........ |
| Portland, Me. | 71 | 600,031 | 2,632,510 | 249,522 | None | 2,700,000 | 6,182,064 | 1,011,411 | None | 325,496 |
| Portsmouth, Ohio | 42 | 4,697 | 367,534 | 424,395 | ........ | 30,000 | 797,528 | ........ | 220,260 | 20,000 |
| Portsmouth, Va. | 46 | 9,500 | 463,012 | 445,455 | ........ | 166,500 | 1,084,467 | 329,000 | 276,196 | ........ |
| Pueblo, Colo. | 50 | ........ | 426,291 | 346,517 | 138,481 | ........ | 911,289 | 796,831 | 568,914 | ........ |
| Quincy, Ill. | 39 | 5,428 | 367,044 | 141,583 | ........ | 224,500 | 738,555 | ........ | 120,543 | ........ |
| Quincy, Mass. | 72 | 622,085 | 2,062,080 | 1,150,705 | 84,500 | 4,270,000 | 8,191,368 | 1,222,289 | 210,429 | 1,107,791 |
| Racine, Wis. | 68 | 46,737 | 881,589 | 693,749 | 48,110 | 528,509 | 2,198,693 | 1,268,058 | 589,794 | 6,158 |
| Raleigh, N. C. | 37 | ........ | 485,853 | 222,967 | ........ | 111,400 | 820,220 | ........ | 191,082 | ........ |
| Roanoke, Va. | 69 | 134,668 | 917,604 | 360,592 | 39,169 | 450,000 | 1,902,035 | 651,448 | None | None |
| Rockford, Ill. | 86 | ........ | 842,407 | 72,965 | 26,000 | 395,375 | 1,336,747 | 1,137,709 | 165,680 | None |
| Rome, N. Y. | 32 | 319,637 | 502,508 | 22,838 | 57,760 | 341,211 | 1,243,954 | 538,804 | 139,090 | 333,000 |
| Sacramento, Calif. | 94 | 67,368 | 1,994,216 | 327,866 | 34,643 | ........ | 2,424,095 | ........ | 516,985 | ........ |
| Saginaw, Mich. | 81 | 206,677 | 974,455 | 829,900 | None | None | 2,010,132 | 1,103,843 | 183,700 | None |
| St. Joseph, Mo. | 81 | 31,000 | 720,452 | 211,931 | ........ | 40,000 | 1,002,383 | 1,083,803 | ........ | ........ |
| St. Petersburg, Fla. | 40 | 163,265 | 942,664 | 775,932 | ........ | ........ | 1,881,862 | ........ | 405,979 | ........ |

## TABLE X.—EXPENDITURES IN 1934 OF CITIES OVER 30,000—Continued

An asterisk refers to notes on page 342.

| City | Pop. 1930 (000 omitted) | General Expenditures (except schools, utilities, and bond proceeds): Welfare and Relief (from current revenue) | Current Operation and Maintenance | Debt Service (interest and bond principal) | Capital Outlays (from current revenues) | Repayment Current Borrowing | Total General Expenditures | School Expenditures (except bonds) | Utility Expenditures (except bonds) | Expenditures from Proceeds of Bonds |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***30,000 to 100,000—continued*** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Salem, Mass. ........ | 43 | $ 401,782 | $ 936,407 | $ 75,564 | $ 700,888 | $2,000,000 | $4,114,641 | $ 498,539 | $ 91,112 | $ 222,000 |
| San Bernardino, Calif... | 37 | ........ | 330,733 | 74,765 | 9,871 | ........ | 415,369 | 705,100 | 187,490 | None |
| San Jose, Calif. ...... | 58 | 12,305 | 625,500 | 104,920 | 32,161 | ........ | 774,953 | 1,383,544 | None | 191,043 |
| Santa Ana, Calif. .... | 30 | 9,173 | 348,405 | 360,810 | 19,145 | ........ | 737,533 | 885,495 | 65,670 | ........ |
| Santa Barbara, Calif. .. | 34 | ........ | 590,430 | 153,332 | 34,776 | ........ | 778,538 | 647,361* | 197,708 | ........ |
| Santa Monica, Calif. .. | 37 | 8,623 | 848,486 | 227,299 | ........ | None | 1,084,408 | 1,122,526 | 466,834* | 434,997 |
| Savannah, Ga. ........ | 85 | 46,601 | 1,592,913 | 340,835 | 12,247 | 235,000 | 2,127,597 | 593,879 | ........ | ........ |
| Sheboygan, Wis. ...... | 39 | 552,182 | 759,934 | 195,811 | 127,694 | None | 1,635,622 | 545,268 | 192,208 | None |
| Sioux City, Iowa ...... | 79 | ........ | 965,460 | 246,755 | 126,439 | None | 1,338,655 | ........ | 273,480 | 51,800* |
| Sioux Falls, S. D...... | 33 | ........ | 759,327 | 133,356 | ........ | ........ | 892,684 | 529,284 | 131,028 | 15,558 |
| Springfield, Mo. ...... | 58 | 8,103 | 621,167 | 74,797 | 21,464 | 40,000 | 765,531 | 660,175 | None | 93,768 |
| Springfield, Ohio .... | 69 | 45,793 | 516,931 | 837,053 | 147,447 | None | 1,403,523 | ........ | 302,254 | 535,716 |
| Stamford, Conn. ...... | 46 | ........ | 1,032,165 | 302,172 | ........ | 543,000 | 1,877,337 | 887,309 | ........ | ........ |
| Steubenville, Ohio .... | 35 | 55,882 | 360,957 | 283,408 | 45,715 | ........ | 745,962 | 564,433 | 80,621 | 49,764 |
| Stockton, Calif. ...... | 48 | ........ | 902,669 | 494,647 | ........ | 176,140 | 1,573,456 | ........ | ........ | 16,331 |
| Superior, Wis. ....... | 36 | 12,000 | 687,421 | 43,885 | ........ | ........ | 743,306 | 883,192 | None | 242,621 |
| Topeka, Kans. ...... | 64 | 94,615 | 743,539 | 667,198 | 16,349 | ........ | 1,521,703 | 1,276,414 | 385,536 | 59,653 |
| Troy, N. Y.......... | 73 | 507,135 | 2,524,759 | 571,928 | ........ | 400,000 | 4,003,822 | 919,413 | 305,208 | ........ |
| Tucson, Ariz. ........ | 33 | 2,197 | 418,333 | 526,256 | 12,847 | ........ | 959,631 | 548,497 | 105,921 | None |
| Waco, Tex. .......... | 53 | 49,194 | 503,779 | 572,173 | ........ | ........ | 1,125,148 | 333,495 | 260,221 | None |
| Waltham, Mass. ...... | 39 | 437,249 | 790,175 | 289,862 | 6,750 | 2,025,640 | 3,549,676 | 624,836 | 134,871 | 91,280 |
| Warren, Ohio ........ | 41 | 1,545 | 138,000 | 382,000 | ........ | ........ | 521,545 | 744,406 | 160,000 | 120,000* |
| Waterbury, Conn. .... | 100 | 445,958 | 2,923,532 | 1,094,195 | 351,682 | 2,750,000 | 7,565,366 | 1,796,175 | 660,840 | 397,875 |
| Waterloo, Iowa ....... | 46 | ........ | 333,674 | 147,896 | 25,819 | None | 507,390 | 553,985 | 139,637 | None |
| Watertown, Mass. .... | 35 | 226,508 | 1,152,359 | 153,929 | 58,231 | 1,515,000 | 2,869,519 | 720,285 | 61,039 | 30,855 |
| Watertown, N. Y. .... | 32 | 506,241 | 617,555 | 140,752 | 44,998 | ........ | 1,309,546 | 749,794 | 264,300 | 335,000* |
| Waukegan, Ill. ....... | 33 | None | 238,000 | 29,600 | None | None | 267,600 | ........ | 180,000 | None |
| West Allis, Wis. ...... | 35 | None | 485,762 | 118,474 | None | None | 604,236 | 629,073 | 113,863 | None |
| **Wheeling, W. Va.** .... | 62 | None | 578,283 | **247,632** | **None** | None | 825,914 | 877,391 | 113,863 | None |
| Wichita Falls, Tex. .. | 44 | 42,229 | 277,907 | 212,774 | 59,041 | None | 591,951 | 496,601 | 102,846 | None |
| Williamsport, Pa. ..... | 46 | 128,537 | 528,209 | 56,146 | ........ | 17,181 | 730,065 | ........ | 76,482 | None |
| Winston-Salem, N. C.. | 75 | 67,146 | 1,289,692 | 1,867,544 | ........ | 500,000 | 3,724,382 | 93,434 | None | 115,000 |
| York, Pa. ............ | 55 | 25,000 | 490,000 | 214,445 | 15,000 | None | 744,445 | ........ | 114,383 | ........ |

## INDEBTEDNESS AT END OF 1934 (OR LAST FISCAL YEAR) OF 239 CITIES OVER 30,000

Cities are arranged alphabetically by population groups; those not reporting are listed on page 341. An asterisk (*) refers to notes on page 342.

| City | Gross Bonded Debt |  |  | Net Bonded Debt |  |  |  |  | Bonds Issued in 1934 | Bonds Redeemed in 1934 | Total Unfunded Debt (Notes, warrants, etc.) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | General | School | Utilities | General | School | Utilities | Special Assessment | Total Net Bonded Debt |  |  |  |
| ***Over 500,000*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baltimore, Md. | 130,680,427 | $26,564,653 | $36,504,500 | $104,593,991 | $25,649,085 | $ 33,210,290 | $ 483,000 | $163,902,366 | $ 1,653,000 | $ 4,237,000 | ........ |
| Boston, Mass. | 82,041,633 | 7,952,000 | 78,278,800 | 65,329,340 | 4,790,505 | 64,034,146 | ........ | 134,153,991 | 5,679,000 | 9,667,000 | 22,312,400 |
| Buffalo, N. Y. | 66,121,327 | 23,722,250 | 17,221,020 | 63,013,879 | 23,722,250 | 12,056,604 | 353,378 | 99,146,112 | 6,717,684 | 1,759,463 | None |
| Chicago, Ill.* | 125,240,000 | ........ | 20,062,000 | 124,103,000 | 41,913,000 | 20,062,000 | ........ | 186,078,000 | 22,300,000 | 8,346,900 | 162,509,929 |
| Cleveland, Ohio | 81,385,395 | 18,317,250 | 30,649,500 | 78,146,790 | 16,153,820 | 27,716,769 | 5,109,827 | 127,127,204 | 7,546,000 | 8,518,051 | 3,587,500 |
| Detroit, Mich. | 204,271,948 | 73,602,520 | 105,262,063 | 191,024,666 | 63,650,853 | 95,724,110 | 5,159,644 | 355,559,273 | ........ | ........ | 9,780,877 |
| Los Angeles, Calif. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 42,188,462 | 62,130,413 | 115,774,600* | ........ | 220,093,475 | 8,000,000* | 6,467,837 | None |
| Milwaukee, Wis. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 27,771,200 | 8,056,500 | 21,000 | ........ | 35,848,700 | None | 4,026,233 | None |
| New York, N. Y. | 613,068,437 | 350,636,851 | 1,309,857,029 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | 1,885,503,756 | 30,291,000 | 25,421,387 | 261,611,815 |
| Philadelphia, Pa. | 356,418,500 | 61,361,000 | 198,736,000 | 271,129,600 | 35,506,405 | 151,061,000 | ........ | 457,697,005 | 2,704,000 | 17,042,000 | 6,795,296 |
| Pittsburgh, Pa. | 56,240,571 | ........ | 7,474,928 | 54,499,355 | ........ | 7,397,581 | ........ | ........ | 7,207,000 | 3,727,100 | 1,071,581 |
| St. Louis, Mo. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 75,703,000 | 1,997,000 | 8,888,000 | ........ | 86,588,000 | 8,200,000 | 3,402,000 | ........ |
| San Francisco, Calif. | 41,660,599 | 12,382,000 | 109,554,201 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | 3,504,000 | 4,983,700 | 1,466,552 |
| ***200,000 to 500,000*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Atlanta, Ga. | 5,615,000 | 5,367,600 | 2,647,000 | 4,807,480 | 5,072,998 | 2,220,685 | 364,900 | 12,566,063 | None | 912,900 | 1,544,194 |
| Birmingham, Ala. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 10,128,000 | 9,808,000 | 100,000 | 3,403,000 | 23,439,000 | 250,000 | 1,117,000 | None |
| Cincinnati, Ohio | 77,057,719* | 15,944,000 | 12,389,530 | 50,314,150* | 12,575,116 | 4,502,573 | 5,183,213 | 72,575,052 | 2,696,092 | 7,101,832 | None |
| Columbus, Ohio | 22,624,740 | 8,912,529 | 6,627,500 | 18,402,188 | 6,343,916 | 5,017,448 | 6,639,401 | 36,402,954 | 3,778,442 | 3,202,983 | 6,986 |
| Dallas, Texas | 20,611,000 | 7,302,250 | 9,021,000 | 19,852,537 | 7,060,141 | 8,486,144 | ........ | 35,398,822 | 500,000 | 1,179,750 | 406,000 |
| Dayton, Ohio | 10,039,590 | 7,890,734 | 4,638,000 | 8,794,982 | 7,890,734 | 3,741,728 | 754,776 | 21,182,220 | 536,562 | 1,243,157 | 360,000 |
| Denver, Colo. | 3,900,000 | 8,715,000 | 20,601,600 | 3,598,832 | 8,715,000 | 20,252,624 | 7,573,400 | 40,139,856 | 1,118,000 | 1,549,500 | None |
| Houston, Tex. | 27,103,750 | ........ | ........ | 23,450,509 | ........ | 2,181,000 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | 582,487 |
| Jersey City, N. J. | 45,171,969 | 15,154,879 | 15,491,254 | 40,937,442 | 13,583,677 | 12,262,856 | ........ | 66,783,975 | ........ | ........ | 3,301,257 |
| Kansas City, Mo. | 21,948,000 | 19,393,405 | 13,449,000 | 21,284,351 | 15,686,690 | 11,738,908 | 1,088,559 | 49,798,509 | 2,025,000 | 813,000 | None |
| Louisville, Ky. | 38,487,800* | ........* | 1,079,000 | 32,335,385* | ........* | 439,914 | ........ | 32,775,299 | 250,000 | ........ | ........ |
| Minneapolis, Minn. | 29,558,076 | 20,645,424 | 3,988,000 | ........ | ........ | 3,732,324 | 9,898,372 | 59,292,808 | 4,807,152 | 4,780,376 | None |
| Newark, N. J. | 78,322,000 | 19,660,200 | 22,061,000 | 70,482,982 | 15,451,117 | 19,329,780 | None | 105,263,876 | 13,508,000 | 3,430,000 | 10,512,000 |
| Oakland, Calif. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 4,224,670 | 12,331,250 | 6,979,000* | None | 23,534,920 | 204,358 | 541,585 | None |
| Omaha, Nebr. | 12,198,097 | 8,723,750 | 7,981,000 | 11,226,048 | 7,956,614 | 3,979,602 | 2,434,000 | 25,596,264 | ........ | 1,002,100 | ........ |
| Portland, Ore. | 22,324,800 | 9,144,423 | 20,977,000 | 19,463,375 | 8,790,740 | 14,964,988 | 5,760,924 | 48,980,027 | 2,587,898 | 3,789,148 | 1,291,522 |

## Table XI.—Indebtedness at End of 1934 of Cities Over 30,000—Continued

An asterisk refers to notes on page 342.

| City | Gross Bonded Debt General | Gross Bonded Debt School | Gross Bonded Debt Utilities | Net Bonded Debt General | Net Bonded Debt School | Net Bonded Debt Utilities | Net Bonded Debt Special Assessment | Net Bonded Debt Total Net Bonded Debt | Bonds Issued in 1934 | Bonds Redeemed in 1934 | Total Unfunded Debt (Notes, warrants, etc.) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***200,000 to 500,000—continued*** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Providence, R. I. | $23,816,000 | $14,478,000 | $20,690,000 | $17,263,609 | $12,275,098 | $14,185,000 | $........ | $43,724,018 | $2,050,000 | $1,508,500 | $3,055,579 |
| Rochester, N. Y. | 35,018,000 | 16,677,000 | 8,623,500 | 33,914,780 | 15,759,823 | 6,028,597 | 7,362,582 | 63,065,782 | 6,702,000 | 5,349,560 | 2,803,955 |
| St. Paul, Minn. | 19,387,000 | 10,424,000 | 6,747,000 | 14,139,000 | 7,959,372 | 5,576,657 | 7,400,000 | 35,075,029 | 1,686,000 | 872,000 | 1,045,782 |
| San Antonio, Tex. | 16,859,500 | 7,171,000 | 6,422,000 | 14,873,342 | 6,339,675 | 5,918,938 | 112,929 | 27,344,883 | None | 935,000 | 5,600 |
| Syracuse, N. Y. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 34,466,962 | ........ | 6,051,750 | 2,624,000 | ........ | ........ | ........ | 5,560,939 |
| Washington, D. C. | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | None |
| ***100,000 to 200,000*** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Albany, N. Y. | 12,170,770 | 5,351,650 | 12,732,500 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | 30,257,890 | ........ | ........ | 400,000 |
| Camden, N. J. | 15,557,693 | 4,015,000 | 1,312,925 | ........ | ........ | ........ | 860,000 | 19,429,169 | 49,500 | 183,155 | 5,665,447 |
| Canton, Ohio | 7,211,502 | ........ | 996,000 | 6,255,930 | ........ | 996,000 | 1,651,157 | ........ | 315,775 | 985,454 | 152,225 |
| Chattanooga, Tenn.* | 11,082,000 | 2,365,000 | ........ | 10,691,007 | 2,365,000 | ........ | 1,243,156 | 14,299,163 | ........ | 91,500 | 569,029 |
| Des Moines, Iowa | 5,674,347 | ........ | 5,403,000 | 5,674,347 | 7,561,000 | 4,553,000 | 940,000 | 18,688,347 | 1,081,347 | 470,941 | None |
| Duluth, Minn. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 5,249,666 | ........ | 2,392,000 | 151,000 | ........ | 51,000 | 270,333 | None |
| Elizabeth, N. J. | 10,123,821 | 5,574,350 | 4,779,000 | 7,607,299 | 5,133,014 | 4,279,000 | ........ | 17,019,314 | ........ | ........ | ........ |
| El Paso, Tex. | 4,548,000 | 2,818,000 | 1,862,000 | 3,827,374 | 2,270,492 | 1,668,365 | None | 7,766,232 | None | 177,000 | 573,233 |
| Erie, Pa. | 6,159,000 | ........ | 1,410,000 | 5,906,845 | 5,398,000 | 1,350,000 | 821,404 | 13,476,249 | 288,472 | 476,000 | 246,553 |
| Evansville, Ind. | 1,438,200 | 2,102,500 | 774,000 | 1,339,329 | 2,102,500 | 751,000 | 297,159 | 4,489,989 | None | 66,000 | None |
| Fall River, Mass. | 5,700,500 | 2,013,500 | 204,000 | 4,989,500 | 2,013,500 | 204,000 | ........ | 7,207,000 | ........ | 1,303,500 | 1,828,325 |
| Flint, Mich. | 8,652,375 | 7,912,000 | 2,419,500 | 7,961,254 | 7,120,227 | 1,595,144 | 2,424,000 | 19,100,626 | None | 600,000 | 354,440 |
| Fort Wayne, Ind. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 844,300 | ........ | 2,199,000 | ........ | ........ | None | 166,400 | ........ |
| Fort Worth, Tex. | 15,632,000 | 4,510,000 | 5,689,000 | 14,708,828 | 3,596,592 | 4,723,793 | ........ | 23,029,214 | 51,000 | 418,000 | 655,664 |
| Gary, Ind. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 2,400,296 | 3,488,000 | ........ | 4,535,151 | 10,423,448 | None | 41,000 | 186,556 |
| Grand Rapids, Mich. | 7,971,500 | 3,979,863 | 2,855,000 | 6,964,539 | 3,979,863 | 1,975,862 | 1,884,351 | 14,804,616 | None | 548,051 | 23,376 |
| Hartford, Conn. | 10,065,000 | 3,142,000 | 3,675,000 | 8,825,000 | 2,682,000 | 3,078,777 | ........ | 14,585,777 | 3,000,000 | 2,325,000 | None |
| Jacksonville, Fla. | 6,013,500 | ........ | 4,877,500 | 5,854,944 | 3,547,290 | 4,877,500 | 916,000 | 15,195,734 | ........ | 484,000 | 117,006 |
| Knoxville, Tenn. | 19,005,571 | ........ | 4,603,822 | 17,509,015 | 2,055,000 | 4,385,520 | 75,548 | 24,025,073 | 240,000 | 123,000 | 1,149,551 |
| Long Beach, Calif. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 10,646,750 | 15,206,321 | 6,421,000 | ........ | 32,274,071 | None | 569,358 | None |
| Lowell, Mass. | 3,904,493 | 776,250 | 395,000 | 3,904,493 | 776,250 | 395,000 | None | 5,075,743 | 882,500 | 978,967 | None |
| Lynn, Mass. | 3,759,800 | 2,619,000 | 521,500 | 3,542,769 | 2,619,000 | 521,500 | ........ | 6,683,269 | 795,000 | 739,000 | 765,000 |
| Miami, Fla. | 16,227,000 | 7,381,723 | 5,365,000 | 16,194,668 | 7,286,777 | 5,365,000 | 7,517,000 | 36,363,443 | 20,500 | 1,913,000 | 529,110 |
| New Haven, Conn. | 15,812 | 355,000 | None | 15,024,091 | 209,672 | None | ........ | 15,233,763 | 150,000 | 1,087,000 | 500,000 |
| Norfolk, Va. | 20,352,352 | 6,034,076 | 14,504,772 | 15,666,920 | 4,679,727 | 10,518,198 | ........ | 30,864,845 | 1,525,000 | 365,200 | 81,229 |
| Oklahoma City, Okla. | 10,729,600 | 6,299,400 | 6,052,200 | 7,688,498 | 4,847,333 | 3,263,100 | 5,700,049 | 21,498,980 | None | 1,590,300 | 155,215 |
| Peoria, Ill. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 1,181,000 | ........ | ........ | 1,801,337 | 2,982,337 | 700,973 | 343,800 | 558,356 |
| Reading, Pa. | 4,386,500 | 6,746,600 | 1,335,000 | 3,903,037 | 6,727,599 | 1,328,518 | 207,000 | 12,166,153 | 3,135,000 | 194,500 | 650,920 |
| Salt Lake City, Utah | 3,837,070 | ........ | 4,743,000 | 3,837,000 | ........ | 4,743,000 | 522,000 | ........ | 425,000 | 250,208 | 1,550,000 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scranton, Pa. ........ | 2,362,000 | 6,170,000 | ........ | 2,297,080 | 5,683,422 | ........ | 793,478 | 8,773,980 | 304,000 | 417,000 | 176,860 |
| Somerville, Mass. ...... | ........ | ........ | ........ | 1,860,793 | 2,280,000 | ........ | 321,000 | 4,461,793 | 1,195,789 | 851,608 | 2,225,000 |
| South Bend, Ind....... | 1,680,000 | ........ | 850,000 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | None | None | ........ |
| Spokane, Wash. ....... | 2,678,000 | 1,072,000 | 305,000 | 2,607,058 | 1,016,070 | 261,195 | ........ | 3,884,323 | 150,000 | 506,800 | 55,000 |
| Springfield, Mass. ..... | ........ | ........ | ........ | 7,807,000 | 2,057,000 | 7,278,000 | None | 17,142,000 | 400,000 | 1,410,000 | 3,972,393 |
| Tacoma, Wash. ....... | 2,620,000 | 1,883,000 | 11,793,495 | 2,244,720 | 1,716,577 | 10,979,673 | ........ | 14,940,970 | 250,000 | 938,500 | 1,212,663 |
| Tampa, Fla. ......... | 11,007,000 | ........ | 2,717,000 | 8,003,735 | ........ | 2,663,997 | ........ | ........ | None | 75,000 | 297,747 |
| Trenton, N. J......... | 9,973,018 | 7,318,500 | 1,002,000 | 8,929,826 | 6,590,208 | 504,679 | 58,852 | 16,083,565 | 431,000 | 1,537,000 | 4,146,416 |
| Tulsa, Okla. ......... | 10,970,785 | ........ | 5,211,000 | 9,777,785 | 4,474,400 | 4,611,000 | ........ | 18,863,185 | ........ | 600,106 | 615,000 |
| Wichita, Kans. ....... | ........ | ........ | ........ | 4,552,926 | 2,783,649 | ........ | 2,320,469 | 9,657,044 | 168,179 | 415,969 | None |
| Wilmington, Del. ..... | 8,494,200 | 886,000 | 4,565,000 | 7,253,619 | 886,000 | 4,565,000 | ........ | 12,704,619 | None | 350,200 | 158,000 |
| Worcester, Mass. ...... | 8,276,000 | 479,000 | 3,232,000 | 7,813,579 | 479,000 | 3,154,082 | ........ | 1,446,621 | 2,374,000 | 2,072,000 | 636,383 |
| ***30,000 to 100,000*** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alameda, Calif. ....... | ........ | ........ | ........ | 304,012 | 450,360 | 53,200 | ........ | 807,572 | ........ | 83,950 | ........ |
| Allentown, Pa. ....... | 5,204,700 | 4,839,000 | None | 5,028,988 | 4,638,512 | None | 307,599 | 9,975,099 | 420,000 | 426,200 | 75,000 |
| Alton, Ill. ........... | 240,000 | ........ | None | 240,000 | ........ | None | 494,100 | ........ | None | 60,000 | None |
| Altoona, Pa. ......... | 1,918,000 | 4,492,500 | 1,414,000 | 1,301,410 | 4,175,151 | 877,638 | 1,507,700 | 7,861,899 | 400,000 | 69,000 | 229,349 |
| Amarillo, Tex. ....... | 3,410,879 | 1,979,500 | 2,110,739 | 2,903,922 | 1,800,794 | 2,094,480 | None | 6,799,197 | None | 80,024 | None |
| Arlington, Mass. ...... | 423,500 | 880,000 | 180,000 | 281,642 | 880,000 | 180,000 | None | 1,341,642 | None | 187,000 | 520,500 |
| Asheville, N. C. ....... | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | None | None | None |
| Auburn, N. Y......... | 1,854,774 | 607,000 | 347,500 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | 394,972* | 505,225 | 15,000 |
| Austin, Tex. ......... | 3,328,000 | 1,123,000 | 1,365,000 | 3,179,288 | 1,072,794 | 1,303,978 | None | 5,556,000 | None | 301,500 | 150,000 |
| Baton Rouge, La...... | 2,591,000 | ........ | ........ | 2,591,000 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | 100,700 | 20,169 |
| Bay City, Mich........ | 250,000 | 1,400,000 | 1,624,000 | 88,979 | 638,582 | 1,526,338 | 89,939 | 2,343,840 | None | 134,500 | 142,249 |
| Beaumont, Tex. ....... | 4,856,000 | 2,312,638 | 2,611,750 | 4,720,125 | 2,174,320 | 2,296,625 | None | 9,191,070 | None | 286,750 | 364,429 |
| Bellingham, Wash. .... | ........ | ........ | ........ | 493,000 | ........ | 282,000 | ........ | ........ | None | 51,000 | 55,043 |
| Berkeley, Calif. ....... | 786,882 | ........ | ........ | 766,083 | 1,895,250 | 10,333,333* | 178,854 | 13,173,521 | None | 158,429 | None |
| Berwyn, Ill. .......... | ........ | ........ | ........ | 141,000 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | 141,000 | None | 350,601 |
| Bethlehem, Pa. ....... | 2,881,400 | ........ | 1,293,000 | 1,645,446 | ........ | 1,067,444 | ........ | ........ | ........ | 214,000 | ........ |
| Binghamton, N. Y...... | ........ | ........ | ........ | 3,338,044 | 3,377,925 | 55,000 | None | 6,770,969 | 1,238,000 | 571,556 | 247,125 |
| Bloomfield, N. J....... | 2,459,577 | 2,586,500 | 1,279,500 | 2,372,269 | 2,586,000 | 1,249,000 | 359,112 | 6,566,381 | 45,000 | 335,500 | 988,426 |
| Brookline, Mass. ...... | ........ | ........ | ........ | 783,000 | 962,000 | 329,000 | ........ | 2,074,000 | 103,000 | 343,975 | 500,000 |
| Butte, Mont. ......... | ........ | ........ | ........ | 1,822,520 | ........ | ........ | 12,780 | ........ | None | 131,300 | 56,000 |
| Charleston, S. C....... | 4,574,000 | ........ | 4,000,000 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ |
| Charleston, W. Va..... | 920,000 | ........ | ........ | 501,614 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | None | 56,000 | ........ |
| Charlotte, N. C........ | 4,635,370 | 1,630,000 | 1,810,130 | 4,376,504 | 1,576,679 | 1,610,331 | 1,887,240 | 9,450,753 | 267,500 | 464,000 | 505,000 |
| Chelsea, Mass. ........ | 1,487,800 | 560,500 | 50,000 | 1,067,356 | 560,500 | 50,000 | None | 1,677,856 | 160,000 | 143,100 | 1,610,965 |
| Chester, Pa. .......... | 3,594,000 | ........ | ........ | 3,090,917 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | None | 226,000 | 25,000 |
| Chicopee, Mass. ....... | 1,075,333 | 198,500 | 436,000 | 1,075,333 | 198,500 | 436,000 | None | 1,709,833 | ........ | ........ | 1,709,833 |
| Cleveland Hgts., Ohio.. | 1,669,914 | ........ | None | 1,121,992 | ........ | None | 1,426,969 | ........ | 34,000 | 718,602 | None |
| Clifton, N. J.......... | ........ | ........ | ........ | 1,984,000 | 2,134,400 | 1,597,000 | 845,571 | 6,560,971 | 549,000 | 86,000 | 7,085,001 |
| Colorado Springs, Colo.. | 527,000 | 902,000 | 2,270,000 | 527,000 | 902,000 | 1,718,100 | 176,300 | 3,323,400 | 350,000 | 632,000 | None |
| Columbia, S. C........ | 1,974,000 | ........ | 1,569,000 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | 893,000 | 88,000 | ........ |
| Columbus, Ga. ........ | 1,891,900 | ........ | ........ | 1,825,500 | 592,300 | 150,000 | 49,900 | 2,617,700 | None | 130,500 | 21,879 |
| Council Bluffs, Iowa.... | 1,253,681 | 681,000 | 150,000 | 1,242,968 | 681,000 | 150,000 | 15,000 | 2,088,968 | None | 160,810 | 69,701 |

### TABLE XI.—INDEBTEDNESS AT END OF 1934 OF CITIES OVER 30,000—Continued

An asterisk refers to notes on page 342.

| City | Gross Bonded Debt |  |  | Net Bonded Debt |  |  |  |  | Bonds Issued in 1934 | Bonds Redeemed in 1934 | Total Unfunded Debt (Notes, warrants, etc.) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | General | School | Utilities | General | School | Utilities | Special Assessment | Total Net Bonded Debt |  |  |  |
| ***30,000 to 100,000—continued*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cranston, R. I. | $ ........ | $ ........ | $ ........ | $1,269,777 | $2,203,000 | $ ........ | $ ........ | $ 3,472,777 | $ ........ | $ ........ | $ 750,000 |
| Cumberland, Md. | 1,895,000 | ........ | 3,044,900 | 1,650,379 | ........ | 2,537,485 | ........ | ........ | 235,000 | 35,000 | ........ |
| Danville, Ill. | ........ | ........ | None | 122,700 | 451,000 | None | 423,203 | 996,903 | None | 96,000 | 203,000 |
| Dearborn, Mich. | 10,500,000 | ........ | 2,362,000 | 7,653,887 | ........ | 1,806,802 | 1,168,766 | ........ | ........ | 108,000 | 67,200 |
| Decatur, Ill. | 55,000 | 946,000 | 614,000 | 55,000 | 750,710 | 554,078 | 2,000,000 | 3,359,778 | 288,000 | 58,000 | 233,893 |
| Dubuque, Iowa | 1,370,063 | 932,000 | 563,000 | 1,157,094 | 760,000 | 390,008 | 389,600 | 2,696,702 | 16,000 | 65,000 | ........ |
| Durham, N. C. | 4,044,403 | 1,746,087 | 3,832,333 | 4,013,994 | 1,699,573 | 3,832,333 | 848,035 | 10,393,935 | 350,000 | 392,000 | 250,000 |
| East Chicago, Ind. | 1,059,000 | ........ | 2,328,000 | 1,047,345 | 1,460,000 | 2,053,859 | 872,931 | 5,434,136 | None | 21,000 | 129,410 |
| East Cleveland, Ohio | 1,256,450 | 2,521,000 | None | 815,701 | 2,163,238 | None | 255,757 | 3,234,697 | None | 288,600 | None |
| Easton, Pa. | 2,799,200 | ........ | ........ | 2,249,187 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | 245,000 |
| East Orange, N. J. | 9,051,681 | 3,123,445 | 736,000 | 8,905,131 | 2,705,719 | 254,373 | 498,819 | 12,364,042 | 2,956,000 | 814,800 | 196,500 |
| Elgin, Ill. | ........ | ........ | 110,000 | 83,000 | ........ | 101,739 | 1,075,000 | ........ | 65,000 | 30,000 | 378,811 |
| Elkhart, Ind. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 133,000 | ........ | 1,170,000 | ........ | ........ | None | 10,000 | ........ |
| Elmira, N. Y. | 2,078,900 | 775,000 | 670,000 | 2,078,900 | 775,000 | 670,000 | ........ | 3,523,900 | 125,000 | 302,000 | None |
| Evanston, Ill. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 584,000 | ........ | 80,000 | 2,697,594 | ........ | 80,000 | 494,628 | 896,400 |
| Fitchburg, Mass. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 1,264,000 | ........ | 453,900 | ........ | ........ | 180,000 | 236,700 | 1,717,900 |
| Fort Smith, Ark. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 496,500 | 898,000 | 884,000 | ........ | 2,278,500 | None | 122,000 | 11,000 |
| Fresno, Calif. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 453,000 | ........ | 2,520,000 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ |
| Galveston, Tex. | 8,109,000* | ........* | 648,000 | 7,519,490* | ........* | 614,703 | None | 8,134,193 | None | 367,000 | None |
| Glendale, Calif. | ........ | ........ | 414,000 | 1,452,500 | ........ | 349,779 | 116,409 | ........ | None | 96,720 | None |
| Green Bay, Wis. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 412,000 | 998,500 | 853,000 | 78,500 | 2,342,000 | 3,000 | 185,200 | ........ |
| Greensboro, N. C. | 6,436,565 | 2,994,000 | 2,741,848 | 6,152,671 | 2,994,000 | 2,741,848 | 5,166,587 | 17,055,106 | None | 89,000 | None |
| Hagerstown, Md. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 2,319,000 | ........ | 2,905,000 | ........ | ........ | ........ | 58,000 | 10,000 |
| Hamilton, Ohio | 1,119,860 | ........ | 1,418,450 | 1,119,860 | ........ | 1,354,180 | 386,085 | ........ | 880,350 | 352,357 | None |
| Hammond, Ind. | 858,670 | 1,337,000 | 751,000 | 858,670 | 1,337,000 | 751,000 | 5,969,507 | 8,916,177 | ........ | 622,361 | ........ |
| Hamtramck, Mich. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 3,807,532 | 2,958,587 | ........ | 83,390 | 6,849,510 | None | None | 264,012 |
| Harrisburg, Pa. | 3,119,200 | 2,812,500 | 1,109,200 | 3,119,200 | 2,642,612 | 1,109,200 | 341,300 | 7,212,312 | ........ | 344,900 | 345,000 |
| Haverhill, Mass. | 1,457,566 | 149,000 | 179,000 | 1,435,566 | 149,000 | 179,000 | ........ | 1,763,566 | 479,566 | 225,000 | 930,000 |
| Highland Park, Mich. | 2,778,400 | 3,418,500 | 1,025,626 | 819,420 | 2,803,710 | 363,558 | 36,528 | 4,023,216 | 205,000 | 227,500 | 330,000 |
| High Point, N. C. | 453,000 | 1,911,000 | 4,449,000 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | 7,769,788 | None | 64,000 | ........ |
| Hoboken, N. J. | 5,276,465 | 3,144,635 | None | 4,420,258 | 2,381,054 | None | None | 6,801,313 | None | 355,281 | ........ |
| Holyoke, Mass. | 1,605,000 | ........ | 1,445,000 | 1,605,000 | ........ | 1,445,000 | ........ | ........ | ........ | 373,500 | 814,985 |
| Huntington, W. Va. | 1,847,500 | ........ | ........ | 1,460,165 | ........ | ........ | ........ | 1,460,165 | ........ | 39,000 | 376,931 |
| Irvington, N. J. | 3,932,675 | 4,048,150 | None | 3,710,894 | 3,423,789 | None | 527,000 | 7,661,683 | None | 359,000 | 992,275 |
| Jackson, Mich. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 1,663,829 | 2,128,000 | 1,079,375 | 390,000 | 5,261,204 | None | None | 415,651 |
| Jackson, Miss. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 6,227,760 | ........ | 843,700 | 750,880 | ........ | None | 300,132 | None |
| Jamestown, N. Y. | 1,068,547 | 1,869,000 | 597,000 | 1,068,547 | 1,869,000 | 511,722 | 531,000 | 3,980,269 | 42,000 | 334,833 | 956,000 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kenosha, Wis. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 723,000 | 2,182,000 | 178,000 | 346,500 | 3,429,500 | 59,000 | 45,000 | 114,470 |
| Kokomo, Ind. | 107,500 | ........ | ........ | 99,466 | 486,500 | ........ | ........ | 585,965 | None | None | 16,775 |
| La Crosse, Wis. | 347,000 | ........ | ........ | 341,500 | 432,000 | 55,000 | 103,526 | 932,026 | 2,100 | 142,681 | 8,794 |
| Lakewood, Ohio | 2,418,260 | ........ | ........ | 2,071,940 | ........ | ........ | 120,699 | ........ | 3,000 | 331,726 | 31,198 |
| Lancaster, Pa. | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | 595,000 | 173,000 | None |
| Lansing, Mich. | 1,853,000 | ........ | 2,677,000 | 1,751,000 | ........ | 1,391,369 | 293,110 | ........ | None | 1,203,500 | 1,355 |
| Lawrence, Mass. | ........ | ........ | 188,000 | 2,039,783 | 1,051,500 | 131,600 | 300,500 | 3,523,383 | 143,000 | 588,250 | ........ |
| Lewiston, Me. | 1,194,500* | ........* | ........ | 969,500* | ........* | 363,500 | ........ | 1,333,000 | None | ........ | None |
| Lexington, Ky. | 2,235,500 | 920,000 | None | 1,989,128 | 890,972 | None | 105,990 | 2,986,090 | 1,662,500 | 170,915 | 216,405 |
| Lima, Ohio | ........ | ........ | ........ | 3,534,991 | 677,000 | 647,500 | 238,015 | 5,096,506 | 7,875 | 409,210 | ........ |
| Lincoln, Nebr. | 1,129,503 | 3,868,500 | 1,849,000 | 969,430 | 3,834,990 | 1,611,042 | 1,000,629 | 7,416,093 | 493,000 | 403,770 | ........ |
| Little Rock, Ark. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 2,100,500 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | 48,816 |
| Lorain, Ohio | 1,093,976 | 977,500 | 280,000 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | 6,500 | 747,222 | 2,064,249 |
| Lynchburg, Va. | 2,554,339 | 1,075,306 | 2,242,250 | ........ | ........ | 1,642,250 | ........ | 4,234,815 | 425,000 | 231,500 | 445,000 |
| McKeesport, Pa. | ........ | 1,517,000 | ........ | 1,731,000 | 1,517,000 | 214,000 | ........ | 3,462,000 | 513,000 | 116,000 | ........ |
| Macon, Ga. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 893,000 | ........ | 240,000 | ........ | ........ | 104,000 | 106,000 | 301,120 |
| Madison, Wis. | 2,253,500 | 2,677,000 | 273,000 | 2,220,700 | 2,654,833 | 273,000 | 744,300 | 5,892,833 | 168,500 | 583,200 | 50,000 |
| Manchester, N. H. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 2,524,992 | 1,047,507 | 213,000 | ........ | 3,785,499 | 187,500 | 473,000 | 500,000 |
| Marion, Ohio | ........ | ........ | ........ | 972,137 | ........ | ........ | 203,500 | ........ | None | 167,500 | ........ |
| Medford, Mass. | 1,863,500 | 1,384,200 | 402,000 | 1,833,500 | 1,384,200 | 402,000 | ........ | 3,619,700 | 465,000 | 571,150 | 1,500,000 |
| Mt. Vernon, N. Y. | 7,706,000 | 4,929,050 | 2,633,000 | 7,204,000 | 4,929,050 | 1,589,000 | 15,300 | 13,737,350 | 1,200,000 | 1,025,000 | 1,721,000 |
| Muncie, Ind. | 289,000 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | 126,000 | 44,000 | 25,000 |
| Muskogee, Okla. | 1,901,093 | 1,198,400 | 594,000 | 905,265 | 668,032 | 201,467 | 607,000 | 2,381,764 | 120,000 | 80,000 | None |
| Newark, Ohio | 664,000 | ........ | 283,000 | 607,946 | ........ | 229,000 | 260,100 | ........ | ........ | 171,164 | 700 |
| New Britain, Conn. | 1,932,000 | 3,253,000 | 1,744,000 | 1,649,123 | 3,151,065 | 1,422,774 | None | 6,222,962 | None | 288,000 | 1,007,000 |
| New Rochelle, N. Y. | 9,482,700 | 6,247,176 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | 15,463,690 | 446,000 | 684,000 | 718,528 |
| Niagara Falls, N. Y. | ........ | ........ | 1,785,330 | 5,563,150 | 5,684,129 | 1,418,160 | ........ | 12,665,439 | 376,000 | 316,700 | 220,000 |
| Norristown, Pa. | 1,135,000 | ........ | ........ | 1,020,508 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | 150,000 | ........ | 360,000 |
| Norwalk, Conn. | 2,521,000 | 871,000 | 1,211,500 | 2,341,665 | 780,000 | 1,211,500 | None | 4,333,165 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 600,000 |
| Oak Park, Ill. | 989,500 | ........ | ........ | 989,500 | ........ | ........ | 1,250,399 | 2,239,899 | 224,760 | 316,851 | 1,013,303 |
| Ogden, Utah | 1,791,000 | 761,000 | 1,002,500 | 1,791,000 | 753,500 | 1,002,500 | 165,928 | 3,712,928 | 12,000 | 122,444 | 3,105 |
| Oshkosh, Wis. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 743,000 | 497,000 | 107,000 | 198 | 1,347,198 | None | 98,000 | None |
| Paducah, Ky. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 1,396,500 | 264,000 | 2,266,000 | ........ | 3,926,500 | ........ | 161,000 | 103,967 |
| Pasadena, Calif. | 4,131,955 | 4,411,000 | 6,574,944 | 3,856,338 | 4,411,000 | 6,395,391 | 3,227,358 | 17,890,087 | 3,297,000 | 625,350 | ........ |
| Passaic, N. J. | 8,556,750* | ........* | 6,396,000 | 7,466,784* | ........* | 6,396,000 | ........ | 13,863,784 | ........ | ........ | 4,881,000 |
| Pawtucket, R. I. | 10,062,000 | 3,805,000 | 3,081,000 | 8,458,967 | 3,125,563 | 2,403,719 | ........ | 13,988,248 | 721,000 | 1,260,000 | None |
| Pensacola, Fla. | 2,474,500 | ........ | 350,000 | 2,155,665 | ........ | ........ | 110,500 | ........ | 86,000 | 55,000 | 115,276 |
| Phoenix, Ariz. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 2,481,500 | 1,412,704 | 5,437,000 | 1,706,568 | 11,037,773 | None | 129,000 | 6,105 |
| Pittsfield, Mass. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 803,000 | 996,000 | ........ | ........ | 1,799,000 | None | 289,000 | 982,000 |
| Pontiac, Mich. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 3,410,000 | ........ | 1,374,000 | 1,123,800 | ........ | ........ | ........ | 2,221,645 |
| Port Arthur, Tex. | 2,601,500 | ........ | 833,500 | 2,520,264 | ........ | 815,225 | 14,000 | ........ | None | 181,200 | 135,923 |
| Port Huron, Mich. | 1,212,958 | 476,000 | 194,000 | 1,210,565 | 476,000 | 194,000 | 209,794 | 2,090,359 | ........ | 114,520 | 1,975,840 |
| Portland, Me. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 3,039,025 | 1,976,000 | None | None | 5,015,025 | 225,000 | 254,405 | 210,012 |
| Portsmouth, Ohio | ........ | ........ | ........ | 2,827,270 | ........ | 906,500 | 864,757 | ........ | 20,000 | 226,855 | 4,598,527 |
| Portsmouth, Va. | 5,370,000 | 747,000 | 2,975,000 | 4,828,629 | 660,000 | 1,626,850 | ........ | 7,111,479 | ........ | ........ | 727,500 |

## Table XI.—Indebtedness at End of 1934 of Cities Over 30,000—Continued

An asterisk refers to notes on page 342.

| City | Gross Bonded Debt |  |  | Net Bonded Debt |  |  |  |  | Bonds Issued in 1934 | Bonds Redeemed in 1934 | Total Unfunded Debt (Notes, warrants, etc.) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | General | School | Utilities | General | School | Utilities | Special Assessment | Total Net Bonded Debt |  |  |  |
| ***30,000 to 100,000—continued*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poughkeepsie, N. Y. | $2,186,292 | $1,458,400 | $ 459,000 | $2,155,641 | $1,452,358 | $ 459,000 | $ 1,048,469 | $5,121,510 | $ 379,000* | $ 170,000 | $ 293,821 |
| Pueblo, Colo. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 380,000 | 1,434,000 | 1,210,000 | 1,422,800 | 4,446,800 | None | None | ........ |
| Quincy, Ill. | None | ........ | ........ | None | ........ | 105,000 | 398,100 | ........ | None | 111,655 | 245,345* |
| Quincy, Mass. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 3,271,000 | 1,554,000 | 418,000 | ........ | 5,243,000 | 1,509,000 | 1,003,064 | 1,950,000 |
| Racine, Wis. | 2,325,000 | ........ | ........ | 2,129,000 | 1,407,000 | 1,013,000 | 514,188 | 5,063,188 | None | 378,000 | 630,804 |
| Raleigh, N. C. | 1,659,921 | ........ | 1,784,000 | 1,515,726 | ........ | 1,784,000 | 2,132,000 | ........ | None | 30,000 | 412,470 |
| Roanoke, Va. | 5,173,000 | 2,650,000 | None | 3,927,476 | 2,224,790 | None | 70,070 | 6,222,335 | None | 72,000 | 145,000 |
| Rockford, Ill. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 253,500 | 1,105,000 | 125,000 | 3,640,500 | 5,124,000 | None | 154,500 | 1,076,980 |
| Rome, N. Y. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 988,667 | 742,000 | 126,000 | 74,000 | 1,930,667 | ........ | ........ | 63,000 |
| Sacramento, Calif. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 4,264,405 | ........ | 2,979,310 | 1,391,402 | ........ | ........ | 220,710 | 206,565 |
| Saginaw, Mich. | 1,074,000 | 1,154,000 | 3,013,000 | 1,012,840 | 1,154,000 | 2,842,834 | 514,654 | 5,524,328 | None | 829,000 | None |
| St. Joseph, Mo. | 3,891,000 | ........ | ........ | 3,872,838 | 2,423,000 | ........ | ........ | 6,295,838 | ........ | 51,000 | None |
| St. Petersburg, Fla. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 6,889,600 | ........ | 4,321,000 | 10,795,000 | ........ | ........ | 236,000 | 30,000 |
| Salem, Mass. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 1,038,300 | 434,500 | 282,500 | ........ | 1,755,300 | 332,000 | 257,200 | ........ |
| San Bernardino, Calif. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 739,750 | 1,498,000 | 258,225 | ........ | 2,495,974 | None | 52,567 | ........ |
| San Jose, Calif. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 1,230,375 | 1,859,000 | ........ | 59,500 | 3,148,875 | 375,000 | 199,350 | None |
| Santa Ana, Calif. | 521,060 | 2,023,000 | 158,840 | 503,420 | 2,004,500 | 154,260 | 1,201,137 | 3,863,317 | ........ | 208,268 | ........ |
| Santa Barbara, Calif. | 1,432,125 | 1,964,375 | 626,000 | 1,343,271 | 1,896,670 | 588,440 | ........ | 3,828,381 | None | 126,550 | None |
| Santa Monica, Calif. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 2,193,000 | 1,752,000 | 1,228,250 | 809,167 | 5,982,417 | None | 173,185 | 5,845 |
| Savannah, Ga. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 3,473,625 | 272,000 | 170,000 | ........ | 3,915,625 | ........ | 157,000 | ........ |
| Sheboygan, Wis. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 113,000 | 359,000 | 200,000 | 151,117 | 823,117 | None | 139,084 | ........ |
| Sioux City, Iowa | 2,117,800 | ........ | 25,000 | 1,696,518 | ........ | 25,000 | ........ | ........ | 51,800 | 167,000 | None |
| Sioux Falls, S. D. | 720,000 | ........ | 290,000 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | 125,000 | ........ | 61,949 |
| Springfield, Ill. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 186,000 | ........ | 2,921,000 | 610,457 | ........ | ........ | ........ | 377,500 |
| Springfield, Mo. | 1,528,000 | 1,743,500 | None | 1,466,502 | 1,593,379 | None | ........ | 3,059,881 | 753,000 | 41,000 | 62,724 |
| Springfield, Ohio | 4,525,295 | ........ | ........ | 4,269,449 | ........ | 390,000 | 540,000 | ........ | 623,936 | 581,270 | 30,000 |
| Stamford, Conn. | 3,106,000 | 2,811,606 | ........ | 2,754,698 | 2,581,606 | ........ | ........ | 5,335,304 | ........ | 210,000 | 400,000 |
| Steubenville, Ohio | 439,590 | 629,750 | 100,235 | 430,990 | 623,938 | 79,426 | 101,900 | 1,336,255 | 173,025 | 82,711 | ........ |
| Stockton, Calif. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 5,817,875 | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | ........ | 201,175 | ........ |
| Superior, Wis. | 842,297 | 1,379,300 | None | 842,297 | 1,369,000 | None | ........ | 2,211,297 | 265,000 | 26,641 | 341,019 |
| Topeka, Kans. | 1,297,259 | 2,091,703 | 663,300 | 1,297,259 | 2,070,825 | 380,736 | 837,490 | 4,586,321 | 47,890 | 604,198 | None |
| Troy, N. Y. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 5,868,744 | 1,324,194 | 872,175 | ........ | 8,065,113 | 832,813 | 549,479 | 652,000 |
| Tucson, Ariz. | 1,639,000 | ........ | 914,000 | 1,244,000 | 1,445,904 | 693,237 | 614,585 | 3,997,726 | None | 316,528 | 89,751 |
| Union City, N. J. | ........ | ........ | ........ | 3,025,000 | 1,984,000 | ........ | 51,000 | 2,360,000 | None | 321,695 | 2,002,412 |
| Waco, Tex. | 2,957,500 | 1,611,900 | 2,390,000 | 2,503,736 | 1,270,107 | 2,053,867 | None | 5,827,709 | None | None | 138,100 |
| Waltham, Mass. | 1,337,400 | 736,000 | 449,000 | 1,337,400 | 736,000 | 449,000 | ........ | 2,522,400 | 107,000 | 317,500 | 1,106,613 |
| Warren, Ohio | 1,486,126 | 1,741,300 | 548,400 | 1,476,127 | 1,741,300 | 408,400 | 534,400 | 4,160,227 | 120,000 | 326,900 | 57,000 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Waterbury, Conn. ..... | 7,245,000 | ........ | ........ | 7,067,637 | 1,369,000 | 7,040,000 | ........ | 15,476,637 | 570,000 | 1,014,000 | 2,113,010 |
| Waterloo, Iowa ....... | 511,000 | 1,325,000 | 393,500 | 409,000 | 1,325,000 | 343,500 | 16,000 | 2,093,500 | None | 149,200 | ........ |
| Watertown, Mass. ..... | ........ | ........ | ........ | 497,000 | 976,000 | 9,000 | ........ | 1,482,000 | 199,000 | 216,000 | 500,000 |
| Watertown, N. Y...... | 1,246,785 | 1,382,650 | 816,000 | 1,142,966 | 1,308,670 | 816,000 | 67,656 | 3,335,192 | 335,000 | 224,000 | 276,000 |
| Waukegan, Ill. ........ | 168,500 | ........ | 1,090,000 | 162,500 | ........ | 1,090,000 | 2,697,893 | ........ | None | 20,500 | 90,000 |
| West Allis, Wis........ | 978,000 | 939,000 | 283,000 | 979,000 | 939,000 | 283,000 | 1,098,231 | 3,299,231 | None | 161,000 | 116,425 |
| Wheeling, W. Va...... | ........ | ........ | ........ | 1,056,400 | 422,000 | 1,543,000 | 97,538 | 3,118,938 | None | 109,300 | 462,790 |
| Wichita Falls, Tex..... | 2,696,500 | 1,855,000 | 693,000 | ........ | ........ | ........ | None | 3,389,500 | None | 45,000 | 25,931 |
| Williamsport, Pa. ..... | 752,700 | ........ | None | 645,411 | ........ | None | 142,108 | ........ | 115,000 | 233,100 | 809,843 |
| Winston-Salem, N. C... | ........ | ........ | ........ | 8,876,000 | 3,367,000 | 2,760,000 | 1,420,000 | 16,425,000 | 355,000 | 767,600 | 600,000 |
| York, Pa. ............ | 1,106,500 | ........ | None | 892,473 | ........ | None | 40,000 | ........ | None | 156,000 | None |

Seventy-one cities not reporting, or not furnishing usable financial data, are:

Akron, Ohio
Amsterdam, New York
Anderson, Indiana
Atlantic City, New Jersey
Augusta, Georgia
Aurora, Illinois
Battle Creek, Michigan
Bayonne, New Jersey
Bloomington, Illinois
Bridgeport, Connecticut
Brockton, Massachusetts
Cambridge, Massachusetts
Cedar Rapids, Iowa
Cicero, Illinois
Covington, Kentucky
Davenport, Iowa
East St. Louis, Illinois
Everett, Massachusetts
Everett, Washington
Hazleton, Pennsylvania
Indianapolis, Indiana
Johnstown, Pennsylvania
Joliet, Illinois
Joplin, Missouri
Kansas City, Kansas
Kearny, New Jersey
Laredo, Texas
Malden, Massachusetts
Mansfield, Ohio
Memphis, Tennessee
Meriden, Connecticut
Meridian, Mississippi
Mobile, Alabama
Moline, Illinois
Montclair, New Jersey
Montgomery, Alabama
Muskegon, Michigan
Nashville, Tennessee
Nashua, New Hampshire
New Bedford, Mass.
New Brunswick, N. J.
Newburgh, New York
New Castle, Pennsylvania
New Orleans, Louisiana
Newport News, Virginia
Newton, Massachusetts
Norwood, Ohio
Orange, New Jersey
Paterson, New Jersey
Perth Amboy, New Jersey
Plainfield, New Jersey
Revere, Massachusetts
Richmond, Indiana
Richmond, Virginia
Rock Island, Illinois
San Diego, California
Schenectady, New York
Seattle, Washington
Shreveport, Louisiana
Taunton, Massachusetts
Terre Haute, Indiana
Toledo, Ohio
Utica, New York
West New York, N. J.
White Plains, New York
Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania
Wilmington, N. C.
Woonsocket, Rhode Island
Yonkers, New York
Youngstown, Pennsylvania
Zanesville, Ohio

The seventeen cities, returned data of which could be used only in the debt table, are:

Butte, Montana
Charleston, South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina
Cranston, Rhode Island
Holyoke, Massachusetts
Houston, Texas
Jamestown, New York
Jersey City, New Jersey
Lawrence, Massachusetts
Passaic, New Jersey
Peoria, Illinois
Pontiac, Michigan
Poughkeepsie, New York
Somerville, Massachusetts
Springfield, Illinois
Tulsa, Oklahoma
Union City, New Jersey

## NOTES ON RECEIPTS, TABLE IX, PAGES 323 TO 328

ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA: Proceeds of bonds for school current expenses.

ALTOONA, PENNSYLVANIA: Proceeds of bonds used to fund current borrowings.

AUBURN, NEW YORK: Bonds proceeds do not include $160,000 tax anticipation bonds which are reported as current borrowing.

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA: Utility receipts cover one-sixth share East Bay Municipal Utility District.

BERWYN, ILLINOIS: Bond proceeds for current expenses.

BLOOMFIELD, NEW JERSEY: Bond proceeds for relief purposes.

BUFFALO, NEW YORK: Of $6,717,684 bond proceeds, $3,000,000 were from delinquent tax bonds and are shown under current borrowing.

CHATTANOOGA, TENNESSEE: Figures are approximations only.

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS: Bond proceeds are RFC loans for school current expenses; Chicago figures do not include parks.

CINCINNATI, OHIO: Bond proceeds include $292,900 for funding of bond anticipation notes.

CLIFTON, NEW JERSEY: Utility receipts include only local, partial water works; Clifton share of receipts of three-city district water commission not available.

ELMIRA, NEW YORK: Delinquent taxes include school and county and state, as well as general.

HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT: Hartford figures are approximations only; proceeds of bond sales for funding temporary loans.

HIGHLAND PARK, MICHIGAN: Proceeds of bonds for funding tax notes.

HOBOKEN, NEW JERSEY: Assessed valuation includes real property only; general receipts include schools.

LANCASTER, PENNSYLVANIA: Delinquent taxes include delinquent water rents, but not school taxes; proceeds of bond sales include $300,000 to fund floating indebtedness.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA: Bond proceeds include $1,615,494 for relief.

MOUNT VERNON, NEW YORK: Bond proceeds are for relief or funding of relief notes.

NEW YORK, NEW YORK: School receipts include an arbitrary apportionment of "general" taxes sufficient to make school receipts equivalent to school expenditures.

NEWARK, NEW JERSEY: Assessed valuation includes real property only.

NIAGARA FALLS, NEW YORK: Grants and shares are from state welfare taxes.

NORFOLK, VIRGINIA: Utility receipts include water works only.

Norristown, Pennsylvania: Bond proceeds include $100,000 for general purposes.

Norwalk, Connecticut: Bond proceeds for relief.

Oakland, California: Utility receipts include Port Commission, but not Oakland's share of East Bay Municipal Utility District.

Pensacola, Florida: Bond proceeds for funding certificates of indebtedness.

Rochester, New York: Bond proceeds do not include $1,000,000 of tax revenue bonds, the proceeds of which are shown under current borrowing; delinquent taxes include delinquent school taxes and also delinquent special assessments.

Salt Lake City, Utah: Bond proceeds include $146,198 for current expenses.

San Francisco, California: Current borrowing includes $1,466,552 against future year's revenue.

Santa Barbara, California: School receipts do not include debt service revenue.

Santa Monica, California: Utility receipts include water and transportation.

Sioux City, Iowa: Bond proceeds for funding judgments.

Syracuse, New York: Figures are approximations only.

Trenton, New Jersey: Bond proceeds include $173,000 for funding relief notes.

Warren, Ohio: Bond proceeds for current operation deficiency.

Watertown, New York: Bond proceeds for funding relief notes of prior year.

## Notes on Expenditures, Table X, Pages 329 to 334

Altoona, Pennsylvania: Bond proceeds used to fund current borrowings; amounts included under other expenditure headings.

Asheville, North Carolina: Utility expenditures included under general.

Berkeley, California: Utility expenditures cover one-sixth share of East Bay Municipal Utility District.

Berwyn, Illinois: Bond proceeds expended for current expenses.

Bloomfield, New Jersey: Bond proceeds expended for relief.

Canton, Ohio: Current operation and maintenance expenditures include general debt service.

Chattanooga, Tennessee: Figures are approximations only.

Chicago, Illinois: Current operation and maintenance expenditures include payments for prior years; bond proceeds expenditures include $21,934,593 RFC loan money expended for school current expenses; Chicago figures do not include parks.

Cincinnati, Ohio: Bond proceeds expenditures include $292,900 for funding bond anticipation notes.

Clifton, New Jersey: Utility expenditures include only local, partial water works; Clifton's share of expenditures of three-city district water commission not available.

Detroit, Michigan: Repayment of current borrowings covers notes, not current.

Hartford, Connecticut: Hartford data approximations only; proceeds of bonds expended to fund temporary loans.

Highland Park, Michigan: Proceeds of bonds expended to fund tax notes.

Hoboken, New Jersey: General expenditures include schools.

Lancaster, Pennsylvania: Proceeds of bonds include $300,000 for funding floating indebtedness.

Minneapolis, Minnesota: Expenditures from bond proceeds include $1,615,494 spent for relief.

Mount Vernon, New York: Current operation and maintenance includes $1,316,795 of prior year charges; expenditures from bond proceeds are for relief or funding of relief notes.

New York, New York: Repayment current borrowings includes $112,619,352 for notes of prior years.

Norfolk, Virginia: Bond proceeds were used in addition to reimburse advances made from corporate funds in prior years for capital outlay projects.

Norristown, Pennsylvania: $100,000 of bond proceeds expended for general purposes shown under general headings.

Norwalk, Connecticut: Bond proceeds expended for relief.

Oakland, California: Utility expenditures include Port Commission, but not Oakland share of East Bay Utility District.

Pensacola, Florida: Bond proceeds expended for funding certificates of indebtedness.

Salt Lake City, Utah: $146,198 of bond proceeds expended for current expenses.

Santa Barbara, California: School expenditures do not include debt service.

Santa Monica, California: Utility expenditures include water and transportation.

Sioux City, Iowa: Bond proceeds expended for funding judgments.

Syracuse, New York: Figures are approximations only.

Trenton, New Jersey: $173,000 of bond proceeds expended for funding relief notes.

Warren, Ohio: Bond proceeds expended for current operations deficiency.

Watertown, New York: Bond proceeds expended to fund relief notes of prior year.

## Notes on Debt, Table XI, Pages 335 to 340

Auburn, New York: Bonds issued do not include $160,000 tax anticipation bonds.

Berkeley, California: Utility bonds cover one-sixth share East Bay Municipal Utility District.

Chattanooga, Tennessee: Figures are approximations only.

Chicago, Illinois: Chicago figures do not include parks.

Cincinnati, Ohio: Gross debt includes $21,832,000 and net debt includes $14,013,073 of Cincinnati Southern Railway bonds, which are more than carried by rental receipts (this rental included in "Other Local Revenue").

Galveston, Texas: General bonds include school bonds.

Lewiston, Maine: General bonds include school bonds.

Los Angeles, California: In addition to $8,000,000 bonds issued, there was an RFC loan of $3,850,000.

Louisville, Kentucky: General bonds include school bonds.

Oakland, California: Utility debt includes Port Commission, but not Oakland's share of the East Bay Municipal Utility District.

Passaic, New Jersey: General bonds include school bonds.

Poughkeepsie, New York: Bonds issued include $260,000 for funding current debt and $125,000 for welfare and relief expense.

Quincy, Illinois: Unfunded debt is defaulted special assessment bonds.

# Part Five

# SOURCES OF INFORMATION

---

Services of National and Federal Agencies

Selected Books and Pamphlets

Selected Periodicals

# Sources of Information

TO guide municipal officials to sources of information, services, advice, and publications which may be of value to them in the administration of municipal functions is the purpose of this section which sets forth: (1) specific information available from leading national organizations and from numerous federal agencies; (2) selected books, pamphlets, and reports published in 1934 and early 1935; and (3) selected current periodicals.

With respect to the first section, the national groups included are chiefly professional organizations of public officials and certain private not-for-profit organizations. Practically all of these national organizations maintain comprehensive, up-to-date, practical working libraries of material that is generally not available elsewhere. Staff members give prompt individual attention to inquiries from municipal officials. The twelve organizations of municipal officials located at 850 East 58 Street, Chicago, jointly maintain Public Administration Service whose research and consulting division is available to municipal officials for field surveys and installations of record systems on a cost basis, and also the Joint Reference Library which aids staff members in answering inquiries of officials.

The services available from federal agencies, reported early in 1935 by federal officials, include only those which have general application. Municipal officials find that unusually valuable, authoritative advice and information can be obtained in response to specific questions.

Municipal officials desiring information or advice on any problem should write first to the secretariat of their state municipal league. For example if a local official has a specific question relating to debt refunding, utility franchises, selection of patrolmen, model ordinances, or any other problem, the state municipal league, of which his city is very likely a member, can supply information on what other cities in the state are doing, what the limitations are with reference to state laws and court decisions, and in many instances supply field consultants in legal, financial, engineering, and other special fields. The services of state municipal leagues are discussed on pages 188 to 198. For information on practices in other parts of the country, the local official should write to the national organization of municipal officials and the federal agencies offering services in that field. Other important sources are local bureaus of governmental research, various departments of the state government, and faculty members of colleges and universities in the state.

# Services of National Organizations and Federal Agencies*

Services and information, listed according to municipal activity, are available to municipal officials on request or at cost. Services of leading national organizations of public officials and other not-for-profit groups are given first, followed by those of federal agencies. Periodicals containing valuable information are listed elsewhere in this YEAR BOOK.

## GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION—*850 East 58 Street, Chicago*

Maintains a general information service on all phases of city government, which is available to cities through state municipal leagues.

Maintains, through the state municipal leagues, a field consulting service which emphasizes emergency problems and the federal relations of cities.

INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION—*302 East 35 Street, New York City*

Makes surveys and renders technical consultant services to state and local public officials in field of general organization, finance, health and welfare, personnel, police, and all matters having to do with the broader aspects of governmental planning, interrelationships, distribution, assignment, and correlation of activities.

INTERNATIONAL CITY MANAGERS' ASSOCIATION—*850 East 58 Street, Chicago*

Answers inquiries on local administrative problems, advising of best practices developed through research and practical application.

Offers at low cost extension courses in municipal administration.

NATIONAL MUNICIPAL LEAGUE—*309 East 34 Street, New York City*

Makes available model laws on bonds, budgets, city charters, county manager, election administration, and registration of voters.

Advises committees and individuals on proposed charters, laws, and constitutions and assists in drafting such documents (fees charged for latter service).

Assists in the formulation and adoption of city and county manager charters.

Makes surveys and recommendations through its municipal consultant service for the reorganization of local governments.

Assists local officials and civic groups in formulating methods of stimulating tax collections; and in maintaining citizen interest in good local government.

---

* A complete list of all national organizations is available in *A Directory of Organizations in the Field of Public Administration,* Public Administration Clearing House, 1934. Not all the detailed services available from federal agencies are listed in this section; specific questions on problems not covered should be addressed to the appropriate bureau or department or to the United States Information Service, Fourteenth and G Streets NW, Washington, D. C. The important services of federal agencies were first brought to the attention of municipal officials by Paul V. Betters in *Federal Services to Municipal Governments* (Public Administration Service, 1931) which also indicates the extent that cities make use of federal services.

Public Administration Service—*850 East 58 Street, Chicago*

Furnishes local, state, and federal governments with advisory consulting services on administrative, financial, and operating problems on a cost basis. In addition to its own technical staff, it has available staff specialists of its twelve constituent organizations and other authorities of national reputation.

Makes administrative surveys, reorganizes departments and offices, and installs budget, accounting, records, cost, personnel, purchasing, and other administrative and operating systems, for governmental units as a whole or for particular departments.

Conducts researches in administrative and technical methods and in the scientific measurement and control of governmental activities, and distributes manuals of practice and standard report forms.

United States Conference of Mayors—*850 East 58 Street, Chicago*

Supplies information on all phases of municipal administration.

Provides loan service on municipal ordinances, charters, and codes.

Furnishes information on federal-city relations including federal legislation, programs, and departmental activities and orders.

Handles individual city problems involving representation at Washington before federal agencies (for members only).

## PERSONNEL

Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada—*850 East 58 Street, Chicago*

Provides technical advice and consulting service in installing or improving personnel practices and methods.

Serves as clearing house for information on all phases of public personnel administration.

Provides at cost, tests for certain positions in the municipal service.

National Civil Service Reform League—*521 Fifth Avenue, New York City*

Furnishes model draft of civil service laws and rules for cities and assists in the drafting of such laws and rules.

Aids in the conduct of educational campaigns for the support and extension of modern public personnel methods.

Public Administration Service—*850 East 58 Street, Chicago*

Makes surveys of personnel organization and procedures.

Advises on civil service rules and regulations, examining methods, service ratings, classification of positions, salary scales, and pensions.

Division of Investigation—*Department of Justice*

Determines whether or not applicants for municipal positions have criminal records, as indicated by the extensive fingerprint file of the Division.

Credit Union Section—*Farm Credit Administration*

Aids in organization of credit unions for groups of municipal employees.

Bureau of Labor Statistics—*Department of Labor*

Issues reports on union wages, employment and payrolls, retail prices, and cost of living in cities.

United States Civil Service Commission

Furnishes to any municipal personnel agency upon request a copy of such types of civil service examinations as are available for release.

Furnishes access to its eligible lists to municipal personnel agencies who may wish to secure for employment purposes the names of qualified eligibles.

Consults and advises with municipal personnel agencies with regard to methods of classification.

Consults with municipal personnel agencies for the purpose of establishing a co-operative research arrangement for exchange of findings and for the improvement of examination methods.

Releases national standards on examinations which have been developed as a result of a co-operative research program between government and industry.

Makes available to municipal personnel agencies and police departments a special police adaptability test which is released through Public Administration Service (850 East 58 Street, Chicago) free of charge to any municipality which agrees to administer the test to its policemen and to transmit the results to the U. S. Civil Service Commission.

## MUNICIPAL FINANCE

Municipal Finance Officers' Association—*850 East 58 Street, Chicago*

Answers inquiries on sources of revenue, budgetary methods, tax collections, audit procedures, accounting methods, assessing land and buildings, financial organization and administration.

Provides at low cost forms for financial statements to send to investors.

Provides information on sound and economical practices in issuing, marketing, and refunding municipal securities.

Public Administration Service—*850 East 58 Street, Chicago*

Makes surveys and recommends improved financial organization and procedure.

Prepares analyses of financial condition, financial programs, budgets, sinking funds, and pension systems.

Designs and installs budget, accounting, treasury, purchasing, assessing, and tax billing systems.

Assists in the preparation of applications to FERA for reassessment and real estate inventory projects.

Furnishes technical supervision in organizing, selecting of personnel, assignment of duties, design of forms, inspection of field parties, preparation of assessments and record-keeping procedures, in making scientific appraisals of property for taxation.

Furnishes technical assistance in conducting tax collection campaigns.

Bureau of Public Roads—*Department of Agriculture*

Supplies sinking fund, annuity, and interest tables for 60 intervals and 14 rates of interest for use in bond calculations.

National Bureau of Standards—*Department of Commerce*

Co-operates in the preparation of federal specifications for a wide range of commodities and compiles lists of firms willing to supply materials guaranteed by them to comply with the requirements of these specifications. These lists and sources of supply relating to 450 federal specifications are available on request.

Publishes national directory of specifications which indexes all available specifications for more than 6,000 commodities.

Publishes an *Encyclopedia of Specifications* of which three volumes dealing with the wick-using industries, non-metallic minerals, and metals have been issued presenting the substance of every nationally recognized specification for the commodities considered.

Makes available for a charge to any municipality the facilities of its public testing laboratories (largest in the country) in testing materials and apparatus.

BUREAU OF CENSUS—*Department of Commerce*

Compiles and publishes financial data relating to revenues, expenditures, assessed valuations, and indebtedness of cities over 30,000.

Compiles and publishes similar financial statistics for smaller cities as a part of its decennial report *Financial Statistics of States and Local Governments.*

FEDERAL EMERGENCY ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC WORKS

Makes loans by purchasing bonds of borrowers pursuant to approval of application.

Makes loans and/or grants for the construction, repair, and improvement of public highways and parkways, public buildings, and any publicly owned instrumentalities and facilities, such as bridges, tunnels, docks, viaducts, water works, electric power and light plants, canals, markets, etc. Thirty per cent of the cost of labor and materials is granted, and if desired by the city the remaining 70 per cent is loaned in exchange for the city's bonds.

MUNICIPAL FINANCE SECTION—*FERA*

Supplies current information on fiscal conditions of state and local governments and a monthly summary of activities of legislatures relating to finance.

Prepares periodic reports on various revenue sources such as sales, income, gas, and liquor taxes and experiences of states in the use of these taxes.

Issues bulletins on property tax delinquency in cities and states, tax assessments, rates, levies and collections, and changes in the tax sources of the various states.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Prescribes an accounting system for municipal electric plants using power generated on a federal waterway (a system of accounts applicable for use by any municipal electric plant is now being prepared and will be provided, when completed, to any interested municipality).

BUREAU OF MINES—*Department of Interior*

Analyzes fuels purchased by municipalities and prepares specifications for testing and sampling coal, coke, gasoline, and oils.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Prescribes for interstate carriers accounting classifications which are also used by municipal traction departments.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation

Makes loans on adequate security to any state insurance fund created for the purpose of paying or insuring payment of compensation to injured workmen and those disabled as a result of disease.

Makes loans to funds created by states for the purpose of insuring the repayment of deposits of public moneys of the state or of any political subdivision.

Purchases marketable securities, satisfactory to the Corporation, acquired or to be acquired by the PWA.

Division of Revenue and Statistics—*Treasury Department*

Makes available treasury decisions and rulings, statistics of individual income returns by counties and cities, value of foreign moneys, reports on condition of national banks, etc. (Complete list of statistics and publications on request.)

## CITY PLANNING AND ZONING

American Society of Planning Officials—*850 East 58 Street, Chicago*

Serves as a clearing house for planning information, advising of important activities both in this country and abroad and advising on problems of planning administration.

Aids in developing legislation for state, regional, and local planning, and urban and rural zoning.

National Conference on City Planning—*130 East 22 Street, New York City*

Aids in promoting the organization of local and regional planning agencies and conferences.

Bureau of Standards—*Department of Commerce*

Supplies a model state zoning enabling act and a model city planning enabling act.

Issues material setting forth the main elements of city planning and zoning and advises on proper drafting of regulations.

General Land Office—*Department of Interior*

Leases to municipalities for public aviation fields any contiguous, unreserved, unappropriated public lands not exceeding 640 acres.

Soil Erosion Service—*Department of Interior*

Demonstrates practical erosion control methods in representative watershed projects, welding all effective measures, such as terracing, strip-cropping, contour cultivation, gully control, forestation, etc., into a completely balanced program of erosion prevention and land conservation.

Co-operates with city and county officials in the control of erosion to conserve land, prevent floods, loss of water supply, and damage to stream channels, drainage ditches, and reservoirs.

Supplies technical and general information on nature of soil erosion and adaptable measures of control.

National Resources Board

Supplies latest information on status and progress of state, regional, county, and city planning.

Makes available to local communities through state planning boards, consultation and advice regarding planning surveys and projects.

Provides in its recent report detailed information on national planning in relation to land use, water resources, surveys, and maps and sets forth a plan for co-ordinated national, state, and local planning.

## POLICE

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE—*505 Metropolitan Police Headquarters, Washington, D. C.*

Distributes through Public Administration Service a standard police adaptability test and model daily and monthly police report forms.

Advises on uniform crime reporting requirements and distributes a guide for preparing annual police reports.

AMERICAN PRISON ASSOCIATION—*135 East 15 Street, New York City*

Maintains a free clearing house on advice and information on the administration of prisons, reformatories, work houses, and jails, on the construction of penal and correctional buildings, and on the treatment of the criminal offender, both inside and outside of institutions.

BUREAU FOR STREET TRAFFIC RESEARCH—*Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts*

Co-operates with public officials in research on traffic problems, the results of which are made available without charge or at a nominal price to cover the cost of publication.

NATIONAL BOARD OF FIRE UNDERWRITERS—*85 John Street, New York City*

Co-operates with municipalities in the apprehension, conviction, and punishment of arson criminals.

NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL—*20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago*

Directs at cost general traffic surveys and special limited traffic studies.

Furnishes at cost educational material including posters, speeches, radio talks, and motion picture films for special safety campaigns.

Furnishes information and advice on traffic ordinances, traffic police regulations, police department administration and organization, and traffic signs and signals.

Conducts an annual national traffic safety contest in which cities may participate without charge.

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION SERVICE—*850 East 58 Street, Chicago*

Prepares and distributes model police legislation, administrative report forms, police record systems, and police adaptability tests.

Advises police departments on organization plans, control systems, crime prevention, communication systems, equipment and training, records and identification systems, and investigation methods.

SCIENTIFIC CRIME DETECTION LABORATORY—222 *East Superior Street, Chicago*

(The services below rendered at cost to municipal police officials.)

Identifies firearms from an examination of the ammunition fired therein and examines other firearm evidence such as powder burns and shot patterns, and restores eradicated serial numbers.

Aids in the detection of deception in cases involving all types of offenses by means of its Polygraph or "Lie Detector."

Examines questioned documents for the purpose of determining forgery, authorships, and in the case of typewritten material whether or not a particular typewriter has been used in producing a particular document.

Identifies unknown chemical substances and detects, by means of chemical analysis, specific substances in any given sample of evidence.

Examines the internal organs of deceased individuals to determine the presence or absence of poison.

Analyzes blood samples and blood stains and conducts blood grouping tests.

Conducts microscopic and microchemical examinations of minute particles of evidence such as dust, fingernail scrapings, soil, hair, fibers, metals, cloth, etc., which often reveal valuable information in the prosecution of criminals.

Develops latent fingerprints and makes identifications therefrom.

Examines bombs and other explosives, both prior to and subsequent to the explosion itself.

Maintains facilities for tapping telephone wires and for installing and maintaining dictographs and similar types of equipment.

Preserves for court presentation such evidence as documents, firearms, bullets, bombs, etc., by means of photography and by the method of making moulage casts, which reproduce objects in three dimensions.

WEATHER BUREAU—*Department of Agriculture*

Issues flood warnings which serve to protect human life in endangered municipalities.

BUREAU OF MINES—*Department of Commerce*

Co-operates with cities to ascertain whether the causes of explosions are criminal or accidental.

BUREAU OF STANDARDS—*Department of Commerce*

Makes identifications, in cases in which the federal government is a party, of typewriting, handwriting, bullets, cartridge cases, and firearms, and analyzes bits of clothing, blood stains, and other evidence found at the scene of the crime.

Supplies information on request to municipal police departments to aid them in the installation of short-wave radio sets.

Makes available a model traffic ordinance and ordinances on traffic signs, signals, and markings.

FEDERAL RADIO COMMISSION

Licenses and assigns frequencies to police radio stations.

Renders technical advice in the development of police radio systems.

BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION—*Department of Justice*

Maintains a national clearing house of information on criminals, providing free identification service from an extensive fingerprint file, by wire or mail, to any official law enforcement officers who request it.

Sends free to cities which contribute fingerprints a monthly bulletin of persons whose apprehension is desired.

Collects and compiles crime statistics which are published in a monthly bulletin, *Uniform Crime Reports,* sent free to city officials.

Coast Guard—*Treasury Department*

Renders valuable service to cities in times of flood, hurricanes, fire, and other catastrophes by performing humanitarian work in protecting property and life.

United States Civil Service Commission

Makes available to municipal personnel agencies and police departments a special police adaptability test which is released through Public Administration Service (850 East 58 Street, Chicago) free of charge to any municipality which agrees to administer the test to its policemen, and to transmit the results to the United States Civil Service Commission.

## PUBLIC WELFARE

American Public Welfare Association—*850 East 58 Street, Chicago*

Maintains field staff which gives technical and consultant advice on relief and public welfare administration.

Serves as a clearing house for information and experiences on all problems in the field of public welfare.

American Association of Social Workers—*130 East 22 Street, New York City*

Participates in studies of existing welfare services in relation to community needs and promotes planning for adequate and modernized services.

Participates in the application of civil service standards to public social work by studying the qualifications needed for specific social work positions, preparing written examinations, and assisting in oral examinations for these positions.

National Probation Association—*50 West 50 Street, New York City*

Conducts city surveys of courts and probation departments.

Drafts laws to extend and improve probation and juvenile courts.

Assists judges in securing competent probation officers.

Arranges special conferences and institutes for the training of probation officers.

Serves as a clearing house for information on probation, juvenile courts, domestic relations courts, and crime prevention.

Public Administration Service—*850 East 58 Street, Chicago*

Makes surveys and advises on the reorganization of welfare and relief agencies.

Prepares manual of instructions and installs improved procedures for all branches of welfare and relief work.

Advises local relief agencies on the improvement of administrative, financial, and accounting records and technical welfare procedures.

Bureau of Home Economics—*Department of Agriculture*

Makes available data based on research in nutrition and family budgets.

Bureau of Census—*Department of Commerce*

Publishes decennial statistics relating to inmates of institutions including paupers, insane, prisoners, and juvenile delinquents.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY RELIEF ADMINISTRATION

Distributes funds for relief of the unemployed to state ERA's which in turn co-operate with local officials in approving work relief projects of a constructive nature and in administering direct relief of various kinds.

Supplies on request data showing analysis of work programs by types of projects, distribution of persons employed, etc.; weekly reports show for each state number of persons employed and their earnings.

Issues monthly reports on number of families, single persons and total persons receiving emergency relief under all programs and total obligations incurred, in 146 principal cities of the country. Data for individual counties available on request.

Makes available information on the occupational characteristics of cases receiving relief, conditions determining residence and settlement of persons seeking relief, etc.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS—*Department of Labor*

Issues bulletins on union wages, retail prices, and cost of living in cities.

CHILDREN'S BUREAU—*Department of Labor*

Collects and publishes current statistics, largely from urban areas, on child labor, juvenile courts, and other phases of child and family welfare.

Makes special studies of child welfare conditions at the request of local authorities, if resources permit.

Renders consultative services on request of local officials on problems of child and maternal health, child labor, juvenile delinquency, illegitimacy, juvenile courts, and family income in relation to child welfare.

Makes available on request comparative monthly tabulations on public and private relief expenditures in 116 cities; also publishes quarterly the *Social Statistics Bulletin*.

WOMEN'S BUREAU—*Department of Labor*

Publishes bulletins recommending standard work conditions which will safeguard the health of women workers, such as sanitary drinking facilities and industrial lighting.

Supplies advice, charts, reports, and exhibit material on employment conditions and problems of wage earning women in specific industries, standards for municipal employment offices, and material for use in civic and vocational guidance classes.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT OFFICE—*Department of Labor*

Operates district employment offices in 723 cities and temporary branch offices in over 1,200 additional smaller communities.

Establishes and maintains standards in the employment services of 24 states which have become affiliated with it under the terms of the Wagner-Peyser Act and have thereby received federal funds on a matched basis. Co-operates with municipal employment offices through these state employment services.

Makes occupational research studies regarding employment opportunities and techniques.

Collects and publishes material on trends of employment as reflected in registration and placement data.

Publishes monthly the *Employment Service News* containing ideas on employment office principles and practice.

## PARKS AND RECREATION

NATIONAL RECREATION ASSOCIATION—*315 Fourth Avenue, New York City*

Answers inquiries concerning the organization and administration of recreation activities such as playgrounds, swimming pools, wading pools, beaches, athletic fields, community centers, and a wide range of other community recreational activities.

Provides field consultants to park and recreation directors; makes surveys and conducts training courses for leaders.

Provides field and correspondence service to school physical directors and educational departments; issues monthly bulletins.

Issues manuals, handbooks, and reference materials on all phases of municipal recreation.

Offers a year's professional course in recreational leadership to a limited number of college graduates; provides a clearing house on available recreation positions.

BUREAU OF BIOLOGICAL SURVEY—*Department of Agriculture*

Advises on many matters concerning wild life in park areas—methods of attracting birds to parks, care and management of birds and mammals, etc.

Furnishes any municipal zoo without cost (except transportation) one buffalo and occasionally elk and deer, under certain co-operative agreements.

BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY AND SOILS—*Department of Agriculture*

Consults with municipal officials on soil problems in connection with development of park areas; aids in selection of airport site as concerns soil conditions.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE—*Department of Agriculture*

Advises officials in eradication and control of insects and plant pests; supplies information on protecting shade trees and shrubs from insect pests.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY—*Department of Agriculture*

Answers inquiries relating to any plant problem, methods of identification and control of plant disease, and methods of growing plants and shrubbery.

Advises on selection of shrubbery, plants, and trees for parks, playgrounds, and golf courses.

Makes available important publications which aid officials in choosing trees suitable for streets and advises on scientific care of such trees.

Offers advice on horticultural exhibits, control of weeds, arboreta, botanical gardens, and transplanting of trees and shrubs.

UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE—*Department of Agriculture*

Provides parks, playgrounds, and tourist camps in national forests, and issues permits for the administration by cities of municipal recreation camps located in the national forests.

Provides detailed information on prevention and control of forest fires.

Protects watershed areas in national forests that contain streams supplying water for cities.

Constructs roads leading to municipal water and power improvements and recreation areas within national forests when such roads coincide with forest development road plan.

Furnishes technical aid and advice in the protection and management of municipal forests.

Bureau of Fisheries—*Department of Commerce*

Gives technical advice in regard to the establishment and care of public aquaria.

Acts in an advisory capacity to cities which practice fish culture in their own controlled ponds.

Assists cities in the formulation of regulations regarding the sale of game fish.

Maintains 87 hatcheries and substations for the purpose of aiding in stocking streams or lakes in municipal park systems.

Makes surveys of streams and lakes to determine effect of pollution on fish, and suggests remedial measures.

General Land Office—*Department of Interior*

Sells or leases unreserved non-mineral public lands to municipalities for recreational purposes.

Leases for public aviation fields any contiguous unreserved and unappropriated public lands not exceeding 640 acres.

National Park Service—*Department of Interior*

Determines location of CCC camps in state and metropolitan park areas, has general oversight of park design and construction, and the development of such areas in which work is undertaken by CCC camps.

Furnishes local park authorities with designs and specifications for several different types of park facilities, such as picnic areas, tables, benches, toilets, picnic shelters, family camps, etc.

Recommends to the FERA submarginal lands for acquisition and co-operates with local authorities in the selection of regional recreational areas, children's group camps, and smaller recreational areas adjacent to cities.

Loans park and recreation plans, photographs, etc., without charge, or sells such material at cost.

Office of Education—*Department of Interior*

Provides information concerning the use of school buildings and grounds for community recreation purposes.

Bureau of Labor Statistics—*Department of Labor*

Makes available detailed information on municipal park and recreation areas in the United States.

Children's Bureau—*Department of Labor*

Renders consultation service on recreation administration in relation to juvenile delinquency.

Prepares playground models of value to recreation director; supplies data on development of leisure-time programs, regulation of public dance halls, game manual for organized play, and related subjects.

Public Health Service—*Treasury Department*

Provides information concerning the sanitation of various park and recreation facilities such as swimming pools, bathing beaches, camps, toilets, water supply, etc.

## PUBLIC HEALTH

American Public Health Association—*50 West 50 Street, New York City*

Maintains a free information and consultation service on any problem in health administration, and, at the request of city officials, makes surveys of health department activities with recommendations for improving health service.

Conducts annual city and rural health conservation contests in conjunction with the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Promotes standards for the guidance of public health workers.

Is making an analytical study of health department expenditures and personnel for cities and counties of various sizes.

Maintains an employment service which records all known vacancies in the public health field and keeps up-to-date a list of available health personnel.

Distributes free of charge an annually compiled list of over a thousand books on health and allied subjects.

American Child Health Association—*50 West 50 Street, New York City*

Conducts health surveys; supplies information on health teaching in the schools; makes available results of studies in infant mortality rates and research in child health problems.

Promotes community organization for child health by lending community workers to public officials; maintains consulting and advisory service in child health.

National Committee for Mental Hygiene—*50 West 50 Street, New York City*

Advises on conservation of mental health, reduction and prevention of mental and nervous disorders and defects, improved care and treatment of those suffering from mental diseases, and special training and supervision of the feebleminded.

Makes available studies of mental factors involved in problems of education, industry, delinquency, dependency; co-operates with local child guidance clinics.

National Organization for Public Health Nursing—*50 West 50 Street, New York City*

Promotes the development of standards and extension of public health nursing.

Maintains a central information bureau and advisory and consultation service on organization and administrative problems.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics—*Department of Agriculture*

Inspects at reasonable charge for quality and grade of food products purchased by cities.

Issues reports on crop and livestock production and movements and wholesale prices of principal products and markets.

Bureau of Animal Industry—*Department of Agriculture*

Confers, through federal meat inspectors, with local officials in matters relating to inspection of meats.

Furnishes advice in drafting ordinances on meat inspection and makes suggestions for an adequate system of inspection.

Bureau of Biological Survey—*Department of Agriculture*

Aids in directing work of rat control in cities, although concerned chiefly with wild-life management.

Bureau of Dairy Industry—*Department of Agriculture*

Acts in an advisory capacity on milk ordinances and on methods of farm and city milk plant inspection.

Advises local officials on laboratory control of milk and its products.

Makes sanitary surveys occasionally for cities where necessary to determine proper inspection methods.

Supplies sample score cards to be used in rating dairies.

Food and Drug Administration—*Department of Agriculture*

Co-operates in enforcing the food and drug act; supplies information on the manufacture and sale of food, drugs, insecticides, fungicides, and caustic poisons.

Supplies information as to composition of food, methods of analysis, etc.

Advises on administrative procedure in food inspection.

Bureau of the Census—*Department of Commerce*

Publishes *Weekly Health Index,* giving for 86 large cities, on the basis of telegraphic returns, the total number of deaths, death rate, number of deaths under one year of age, infant mortality rate, and deaths from automobile accidents, as compared with previous year.

Bureau of Mines—*Department of Interior*

Makes available studies of the effects on health of breathing mineral dust.

Makes surveys on the extent of pollution of harbor waters by oil discharged by steamers.

Conducts sanitary surveys in mining towns.

Advises cities on problems of stream pollution caused by acid mine drainage.

Children's Bureau—*Department of Labor*

Prepares and distributes bulletins on child care and training and on maternal health.

Grants permission to reprint valuable material on health education on request.

Loans exhibits, slides, and films showing essentials of infant care, effect of rickets, child physical development, etc.

Makes special studies in cities, as resources permit, on matters pertaining to child welfare and maternity care.

Public Health Service—*Treasury Department*

Supplies direct assistance on projects having wide significance such as disposal of waste, water purification, industrial hygiene.

Makes surveys of entire city health administration at request of city officials in so far as personnel and funds permit.

Gives expert advice and assistance to cities in the event of epidemics or unusual outbreaks of disease when such service is not available through ordinary sources.

Makes sanitary surveys of physical conditions such as water supply, sewerage system, garbage disposal, and other matters affecting public health.

Makes available a standard milk ordinance and standard milk control code, and recommends what is considered satisfactory compliance.

Makes milk sanitation surveys and computes ratings for cities which have adopted standard milk ordinance.

Makes venereal disease prevalence surveys.

Assists seaport cities in prevention and suppression of epidemic diseases from foreign countries.

Examines specimens forwarded by cities and makes reports without cost to local health departments in rare or unusual cases affecting general public health.

Assists in organizing and supporting county health departments, many of which serve smaller cities.

Makes available through *Public Health Reports* (free to city health officers) information on prevalence of diseases in cities and results of investigation on control and prevention of diseases.

Publishes current mortality and morbidity statistics which are valuable to health officers.

Prepares two radio broadcasts a month for use by local health authorities.

Supplies free information service to cities on all local health problems; participates in local health education campaigns.

Operates institutions for lepers and drug addicts to which persons from any section of the country may be sent.

Makes available decisions of courts of last resort having a bearing on public health administration; directories of full-time city and county health officers.

Issues semi-monthly, for public health officers only, mimeographed bulletin, *The Hospital News,* directing attention to reports on clinical research, treatment, case histories, practices and observations, and administrative information of value to hospital personnel.

Issues information quarterly on important state and local activities for the betterment of negro health.

Makes available data on number of cases of and deaths from important notifiable diseases in states and in cities over 100,000 population; also data on venereal diseases monthly.

## HOUSING

National Association of Housing Officials—*850 East 58 Street, Chicago*

Answers inquiries and distributes information on all phases of public housing and public regulation of private housing.

Distributes free to public officials manuals on administrative procedure or significant phases of a comprehensive housing program, including legislation and surveys.

Offers a free but limited consulting service to responsible groups in local communities interested in developing housing programs.

Offers aid by means of field consultants in the organization of housing programs, making surveys, and drafting housing ordinances.

American Association of Social Workers—*130 East 22 Street, New York City*

Participates in studies of the social cost of poor housing.

Assists in the selection of staffs for low-cost housing projects.

Advises on problems of rehousing caused by slum clearance.

Division of Subsistence Homesteads—*Department of Interior*

Constructs and sells to families of low income subsistence homesteads consisting of house and small tracts of land within commuting distance of industrial centers on which workers, often part-time or seasonally employed, may raise considerable portions of their food.

Co-operates with state and local groups in locating projects, and if projects are approved, buys and improves land, builds houses, installs utilities, sells to homesteaders, and provides guidance and supervision following sale.

HOUSING DIVISION, PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

Constructs and operates large-scale, low-rent housing projects with the ultimate aim of turning them over to a responsible local agency.

Sends to cities that have made surveys or have otherwise shown a genuine interest in housing, field representatives to study sites and to consult with interested local groups. If project is approved, it acquires land, constructs buildings, and arranges for operation of projects.

## FIRE

NATIONAL FIRE PROTECTION ASSOCIATION—*60 Batterymarch Street, Boston*

Makes available engineering standards which are useful as a basis for municipal legislation.

Publishes model ordinances for the control of fire hazards.

Maintains a staff of field engineers to assist cities in the organization of municipal fire prevention activities.

Makes surveys of municipal facilities for fire protection and recommends methods for reducing municipal fire losses.

Supplies educational material for fire prevention campaigns.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FIRE FIGHTERS—*A. F. of L. Building, Washington, D. C.*

Makes available statistics regarding salaries, pensions, and working conditions of fire department employees.

Makes available statistics showing fire losses, number of pieces of apparatus, fire department appropriations, number of firemen, etc.

NATIONAL FIRE WASTE COUNCIL—*U. S. Chamber of Commerce, Washington*

Sponsors annual fire waste contest in cities.

Promotes the fire college movement and training of firemen.

NATIONAL BOARD OF FIRE UNDERWRITERS—*85 John Street, New York City*

Makes extensive surveys, without cost, of all fire protection facilities and of physical conditions in mercantile and manufacturing districts, followed by a report with suggestions for correcting defects.

Offers advice on proper types of construction, protection of hazards, and installation of private fire protection equipment.

Reviews and criticizes proposed municipal building codes.

Co-operates with municipalities in the apprehension, conviction, and punishment of arson criminals.

Furnishes advisory service on the adequacy and effectiveness of water supply systems, fire departments, and fire alarm systems.

Supplies educational material for fire prevention campaigns, model ordinance and codes, recommended regulations, etc.

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION SERVICE—*850 East 58 Street, Chicago*

Makes administrative surveys of the lay-out of districts, equipment, records, training programs, and fire prevention methods.

UNDERWRITERS' LABORATORIES—*207 East Ohio Street, Chicago*

Inspects without cost lengths of fire hose furnished by cities and makes detailed report that is valuable to city purchasing agents in buying hose.

Provides model specifications for use in purchasing rubber-lined fire hose, and advises on the care and maintenance of fire hose.

Inspects and labels all types of fire protection appliances.

BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY AND SOILS—*Department of Agriculture*

Furnishes advice on methods of preventing and controlling dust explosions and on spontaneous heating and ignition.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION—*Department of Agriculture*

Provides officials with information on rural community fire departments, dust control in grain elevators, fire and explosion hazards in dusty industries, forest fires, weather conditions, etc.

WEATHER BUREAU—*Department of Agriculture*

Furnishes statistics of wind force and direction which aid in determining the origin of fires resulting from flying sparks.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS—*Department of Commerce*

Makes available specifications for manual fire alarm systems; data on automatic sprinkler protection of airplane hangars, etc.

Makes tests of fire resisting properties of building materials.

Makes available manual of fire loss prevention that is extremely valuable to fire departments.

BUREAU OF MINES—*Department of Interior*

Advises regarding the selection and use of gas masks and oxygen breathing apparatus for city fire departments.

Assists cities in dust explosion prevention work by supplying lecture material, demonstrations, motion pictures, and data on dust explosion hazards.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION—*Department of Interior*

Co-operates with cities in developing training programs for firemen and publishes a textbook for teaching fire fighting.

Maintains a staff of instructors who aid, through state vocational boards, in conducting local training schools for firemen.

## PUBLIC WORKS

JOINT SECRETARIAT, AMERICAN SOCIETY OF MUNICIPAL ENGINEERS AND INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC WORKS OFFICIALS—*850 East 58 Street, Chicago*

Maintains information service on public works and municipal engineering problems.

Prepares special reports on current problems and collects data on costs and methods of public works departments.

Prepares and distributes standard specifications for various operations.

Conducts research in public works and municipal engineering administration and methods.

AMERICAN ENGINEERING COUNCIL—*744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.*

Recommends, on request of municipal officials, consulting engineers or engineering firms for specific kinds of municipal work.

Obtains information from bureaus of the federal government on the request of municipal officials.

Appoints through its member organizations engineering committees to study problems in any locality in which an engineering society is located.

AMERICAN ROAD BUILDERS' ASSOCIATION—*National Press Building, Washington, D. C.*

Makes available through its several research committees valuable reports relating to the construction and maintenance of streets and highways.

HIGHWAY RESEARCH BOARD, NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL—*2101 Constitution Avenue, Washington, D. C.*

Serves as a clearing house for highway and municipal engineers on highway research information relating to finance, economics, design, material, construction, maintenance, and traffic.

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION SERVICE—*850 East 58 Street, Chicago*

Conducts surveys in public works and municipal engineering administration and methods.

Installs comprehensive records, cost accounting, and general accounting systems.

BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY AND SOILS—*Department of Agriculture*

Aids in the selection of airport sites as concerns soil conditions.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE—*Department of Agriculture*

Advises on methods of eradication and control of insects which interfere with the successful operation of sewage disposal plants.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS—*Department of Agriculture*

Supervises the administration of federal aid for highways in the various states, part of which is expended within cities.

Supplies data on results of research on problems of highway design, construction, administration, and finance.

Complies with all municipal requests for information which it has available, although primarily concerned with rural roads and their extension into and through cities.

WEATHER BUREAU—*Department of Agriculture*

Supplies basic meteorological information which enables municipal officials to plan for snow removal, protection of water-cooled gasoline engines, protection of undried concrete paving work and sewer excavations, the shifting of laborers from work hampered by the weather to work necessitated by the weather, and more effective methods of heating buildings and of constructing sewers.

Furnishes data regarding rainfall which are useful in selecting reservoir sites and in connection with construction of water works, bridges, and culverts and storm sewer systems.

Furnishes river data which are utilized by filtration plants in developing methods of purifying water used for drinking purposes.

Furnishes river data which are necessary in studies of stream flows, dredging operations, dam construction, and in practically every phase of bridge building, levee work, and general river improvement.

(Above information available by telephone any hour of the day from nearest weather bureau office, by correspondence, and from daily weather maps.)

BUREAU OF AIR COMMERCE—*Department of Commerce*

Assists municipalities through correspondence in connection with their airport problems.

Sends representatives in the case of scheduled air line terminals to inspect airports or proposed sites.

Inspects scheduled air transport airports for compliance with minimum requirements governing their use as airline stops.

Publishes bulletins on the design and management of airports and a bulletin listing all the airports in the United States, and their facilities; also issues weekly notices of new airports, and navigation aids.

Furnishes information for use in establishing roof markings to identify cities for airmen in flight.

Maintains a register of licensed and identified aircraft and licensed airmen; furnishes information with respect to these licenses upon request.

BUREAU OF LIGHTHOUSES—*Department of Commerce*

Consults with and furnishes information to municipal authorities regarding the establishment and maintenance of aids to navigation required for municipal purposes.

Prescribes and issues regulations for the lighting of bridges maintained by municipalities over navigable waters.

Furnishes to municipalities at reasonable cost buoys and other special equipment that are not usually obtainable in the general market.

Co-operates with municipalities on all lighthouse matters, through district offices maintained in principal sea and lake ports.

BUREAU OF STANDARDS—*Department of Commerce*

Offers facilities of the largest public testing laboratory in the country, for a charge, to any municipality which wishes to have materials tested.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY—*Department of Commerce*

Furnishes available triangulation and leveling control data to municipalities as a basis for local surveys.

Makes available a manual on city surveys and several new publications on use of plane co-ordinates.

Provides upon request copies of original topographic and field records of conditions when surveys are made, which are valuable for use in litigation over land ownership and studies of coastal erosion.

Issues complete nautical charts of coasts, large-scale harbor charts, and airway maps which are useful for geographic purposes.

Distributes data on inland and coastal waters, tides, and currents; supplies information of value to regions subject to earthquakes.

FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT STABILIZATION OFFICE—*Department of Commerce*

Supplies information on the advantages and methods of advance planning of public works for cities and counties.

Compiles data on the volume of total construction expressed in dollars and contracts awarded, volume of public works construction expressed by bonds of surety companies, and cost of construction expressed in value of construction materials.

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD BUREAU—*Department of Commerce*

Makes studies of individual ports which are published and made available at low price.

Advises with local communities regarding the appropriate location and plan of construction of wharves, piers, and water terminals.

Investigates any matters that may tend to promote or encourage the use by vessels of ports adequate to care for the freight which would naturally pass through such ports.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC WORKS

Makes loans and/or grants for the construction, repair, and improvement of public highways and parkways, public buildings, and any publicly owned instrumentalities and facilities, such as bridges, tunnels, docks, viaducts, water works, electric power and light plants, canals, markets, etc. Thirty per cent of the cost of labor and materials is granted, and if desired by the city the remaining 70 per cent is loaned in exchange for the city's bonds.

INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

Advises with cities upon request on problems relating to inland water terminal facilities.

BUREAU OF MINES—*Department of Interior*

Conducts research and offers consulting service to municipalities on the solution of problems involving dangerous accumulation of sewer gas and sewer gas explosions.

Co-operates with cities on the safe storage and use of explosives in blasting for city developments and road ways.

GENERAL LAND OFFICE—*Department of Interior*

Leases for public aviation fields any contiguous unreserved and unappropriated lands not exceeding 640 acres.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY—*Department of Interior*

Publishes topographic and other maps, and many reports on geology, mineral, and water resources, stream flow records, and the utilization and control of waters which are helpful to public works departments.

Furnishes information as to practical sources and available amounts of needed mineral supplies which are useful for road building material.

SOIL EROSION SERVICE—*Department of Interior*

Advises municipalities on all matters pertaining to control of soil erosion, soil conservation, prevention of floods, protection of water supply, curb silting of stream channels, municipal reservoirs, and irrigation systems.

Supplies technical information on the nature and extent of erosion and measures of control for any locality in the country.

Coast Guard—*Department of Treasury*

Regulates movements and anchorages of vessels in ports and harbors where federal regulations are in force.

Advises cities on all marine affairs.

Chief of Engineers—*War Department*

Co-operates with municipal authorities through its district and division engineers in furnishing information pertaining to the lay-out of port improvements, harbor lines, location of bridges, piers, wharves, and terminal facilities, regulations for the operation of bridges over navigable waters, and the issuance of federal permits for structures or changes in navigable waters.

Prepares detailed engineering data on flood control in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River and the Sacramento River.

Prepares detailed engineering data which may be examined by municipal officials at district and division offices on the preservation and maintenance of rivers and harbors, and inland and intra-coastal waterways, including the extent and depth of channels, breakwaters, locks and dams, and laws pertaining to traffic regulations and commerce.

Executes surveys of streams and waterways for the formulation of plans and improvements in the interest of navigation, power development, flood control, irrigation, and publishes data relating to tidal variation at ports.

Issues a series of publications describing the port facilities, harbor capacity, and transportation and rail terminals for ports and harbors on the Great Lakes and sea coasts.

## REGULATORY INSPECTION

Bureau of Chemistry and Soils—*Department of Agriculture*

Furnishes advice and publishes material on methods of preventing and controlling dust explosions.

Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine—*Department of Agriculture*

Assists in drafting building code provisions for the control of insects which destroy timbers in buildings, such as termites.

Suggest remedies for the control of insects which become municipal problems.

Bureau of Standards—*Department of Commerce*

Co-operates with cities in the formulation and administration of safety codes for the regulation of elevators, dumb waiters, escalators, window cleaning, etc., many of which have been prepared by the Bureau.

Assists municipalities with problems arising in the preparation and revision of building and plumbing codes.

Collects and disseminates information on the status of building and plumbing code requirements with particular reference to extent and deviation from established standards.

Encourages the use of standards for quality of building materials and standard methods of testing.

Assists cities in the drafting and administration of weights and measures ordinances.

Bureau of Mines—*Department of Interior*

Makes studies and issues reports on efficiency in the use of fuels, which enable cities to attack the problem of smoke abatement.

Publishes a standard smoke abatement ordinance which has been adopted by several cities.

Offers consulting service on problems relating to the ventilation of tunnels.

Bureau of Labor Statistics—*Department of Labor*

Issues publications relating to safety codes in a wide range of fields.

## MUNICIPAL UTILITIES

American Water Works Association—*29 West 39 Street, New York City*

Makes available information on standard practices in water works management and prepares standard specifications.

Answers inquiries on all matters pertaining to water works.

American Gas Association—*420 Lexington Avenue, New York City*

Makes available at low cost a large number of technical bulletins and pamphlets on the management and operation of gas works.

Edison Electric Institute—*420 Lexington Avenue, New York City*

Makes available at low cost a large number of technical bulletins and pamphlets on the management and operation of electric light and power plants.

National Board of Fire Underwriters—*85 John Street, New York City*

Furnishes advisory service on the adequacy and effectiveness of water supply systems.

Public Administration Service—*850 East 58 Street, Chicago*

Designs and installs billing, finance, accounting, and cost systems.

Public Ownership League of America—*127 North Dearborn Street, Chicago*

Furnishes advice and assistance to municipalities considering public ownership projects.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics—*Department of Agriculture*

Publishes bulletins relating to the establishment and administration of municipal markets and makes reports on special marketing problems on request.

United States Forest Service—*Department of Agriculture*

Protects watersheds within the national forests, upon which many municipalities are dependent for water supply.

Issues permits for the development of municipal water supply systems in national forests.

Furnishes technical assistance and advice to municipalities on watershed protection problems.

Makes investigations which are requisite to the issuance of special permits to municipalities by the Federal Power Commission for the use of water power from national forest streams.

Bureau of the Census—*Department of Commerce*

Publishes quinquennial statistics on electrical utilities.

BUREAU OF STANDARDS—*Department of Commerce*

Collects and distributes information and establishes standards for electricity, gas, and telephone service.

Conducts research on methods of preventing electrolysis which occurs when current utilized by private utilities is returned to the power plant via gas and water pipes and cables, thus enabling municipalities when granting franchises to make effective regulations for the purpose of mitigating the effects of electrolytic action.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Issues licenses to municipalities permitting the use of public lands for the construction, operation, and maintenance of dams, water conduits, reservoirs, power houses, transmission lines, and other works necessary or convenient for the generation of electricity by water power.

Issues licenses permitting the construction of projects on navigable streams or other waters under federal jurisdiction.

Prescribes an accounting system for a municipal plant having a license from the Federal Power Commission.

Provides to any interested city a system of accounts now in preparation that will be applicable in its major features to any municipality operating its own electrical plant.

Investigates, compiles, and analyzes through its electric rate surveys the rates charged for electrical energy to residential, rural, commercial, and industrial consumers throughout the United States, by private and municipal corporations.

Is preparing in connection with its electric rate survey a special report available June 30, 1935, which will compare rates and costs of municipal plants and private companies.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Makes available through a series of individual reports the results of a series of investigations of specific utility holding and operating companies with respect to financial structures, capital assets and liabilities, methods of issuing securities, organization and expenses, and other financial data.

BUREAU OF MINES—*Department of Interior*

Conducts research the results of which are distributed in technical publications on the technology of natural gas and artificial city gas.

Makes monthly reports on electricity output subdivided according to fuel used for purposes of generation.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY—*Department of Interior*

Gives information as to practical sources and available amounts of natural gas.

Co-operates with cities on a share-the-cost basis in the investigation of surface and underground waters with reference to their quantity, quality, availability, control, and utilization.

Co-operates with municipalities in examining geological conditions that affect the suitability of areas or sites for reservoirs, dams, and aqueducts.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—*Department of Interior*

Sells under contract surplus electric power and water to cities located near its projects.

Issues permits to municipalities authorizing the use of public or reserve lands, except those in national forests, for electric generating plants and transmission lines, and for water plants, reservoirs, and conduits.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Prescribes for interstate carriers accounting classifications which also are used by municipal traction departments.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS—*Department of Labor*

Publishes regularly information concerning typical bills and labor costs in utility services.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Furnishes information regarding valuation, cost, and rates for electric service in communities within reach of the Authority.

Co-operates with municipalities affected by or participating in the Authority's program of flood control, navigation, erosion control, the disposal of surplus power and related projects in the drainage basin of the Tennessee River, which includes parts of Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, and Kentucky.

FEDERAL PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

Makes available under certain conditions loans and grants for construction and extensions of public utilities.

## EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF SUPERINTENDENCE, N. E. A.—*1201, 16 Street, NW, Washington, D. C.*

Aids superintendents by means of bibliographies, reports, and statistical tabulations on questions met in administering local school systems.

Makes available practical material on such subjects as school finance, teacher participation, public relations, and school budgets.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR ADULT EDUCATION—*60 East 42 Street, New York City*

Offers free information service on all forms of adult education.

Arranges conferences and co-operates with local communities in the organization of study groups or the establishment of special agencies for adult education.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION—*744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.*

Acts as a general clearing house for educational problems in all fields.

Makes available data on the functions and organization of various agencies of education as related to law.

Is preparing to offer a comprehensive financial service to educational organizations and systems.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS—*1201, 16 Street, NW, Washington, D. C.*

Publishes books and pamphlets which are designed to give assistance in the organization and procedure of local parent-teachers' units, essential information on committee activities and projects, and source material for building programs.

Offers at low cost a series of correspondence courses designed to give instruction on various important phases of parent-teacher work.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY RELIEF ADMINISTRATION

Carries on activities in general and vocational education of adults, rehabilitation, instruction for unemployed high school graduates, and establishment of nursery schools.

FEDERAL PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

Makes available under certain conditions loans and grants for public school buildings.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION—*Department of Interior*

Conducts school surveys at the request of municipal school authorities, paying the salaries of members of its own staff who participate in the survey, all other costs being met by the local authorities.

Acts at nominal cost in a consultative capacity on any proposed plans for education and makes recommendations.

Advises school systems on problems of uniform records and accounts.

Answers inquiries on any phase of public school administration and supervision, curriculum, parent education, finance, and buildings.

Publishes annually about thirty bulletins containing information on municipal school administration such as teacher retirement plans, teaching by radio, selection and appointment of teachers, school organization, etc.

Advises cities on types and source of visual educational material (traveling photograph exhibits, slides, movies, maps, charts) available for loan to public schools by various federal agencies.

Encourages and aids in the establishment of public forums for the impartial discussion of important public questions.

Co-operates with local communities on vocational problems, but only through state vocational boards.

Assists local vocational educational agencies in training programs to enable workers to improve their ability on the job.

Participates in local surveys of facilities for vocational education to the extent that its funds and personnel permit.

Maintains an educational library of about 175,000 volumes which may be consulted in Washington or through the inter-library loan system.

BUREAU OF NATURALIZATION—*Department of Labor*

Assists municipal school systems in training applicants for naturalization in citizenship responsibilities.

Publishes and distributes *The Federal Textbook on Citizenship Training* free to candidates for citizenship in public school classes.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Answers inquiries from municipal museums regarding scientific questions such as names of objects of natural history, identification of material, etc.

Distributes to other museums duplicate specimens where available, thus enabling them to build up better collections.

Advises with and assists through conference and correspondence on problems confronting cities regarding the establishment of museums.

# PUBLIC LIBRARIES

American Library Association—*520 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago*

Gives free advisory and information service on library administration, development, and establishment (directly or in co-operation with state library extension agencies).

Recommends experienced library surveyors when a careful study of a local library is needed.

Maintains free personnel service which aids librarians seeking positions and libraries needing librarians and assistants.

Publishes and sells books, periodicals, and pamphlets on adult education, book selection, and all phases of library administration.

Public Administration Service—*850 East 58 Street, Chicago*

Conducts surveys of public library administrative methods and organization.

Designs and installs improved administrative financial, accounting, records, and statistics systems.

Public Documents Clearing House—*State House, Providence, Rhode Island*

Promotes and arranges for the exchange of public documents among state and university libraries.

Carries on special projects such as preparation of complete check list of published session laws of various states, showing in what libraries they may be found.

Library of Congress*

Sells to city libraries at cost printed catalog cards for books acquired.

Loans certain books to city libraries under the inter-library loan plan.

Assists city libraries with an extensive bibliographic service.

Distributes free of charge such of its own publications as may seem to be of value to city libraries.

Exchanges duplicates with city libraries.

Provides information on cataloging of periodicals, maps, manuscripts, and classification schemes.

---

*Bibliographies on special subjects are usually available to city libraries upon request to federal departmental and bureau libraries, of which there are ninety-eight.

# Selected Books and Pamphlets for Municipal Officials*

The more important books, pamphlets, and reports published in 1934 or early in 1935 (1934 unless otherwise indicated) dealing with the various phases of local government administration, selected because of their value to American municipal officials.

## GENERAL

THE CINCINNATI PLAN OF CITIZEN ORGANIZATION FOR POLITICAL ACTIVITY. By National Municipal League, 309 East 34 Street, New York. 19pp. 35 cents.

A DIRECTORY OF ORGANIZATIONS IN THE FIELD OF GOVERNMENTAL RESEARCH, 1935. By Governmental Research Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 1935. 23pp. $1.

A DIRECTORY OF ORGANIZATIONS IN THE FIELD OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION. By Public Administration Clearing House, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 178pp. $1.

MANAGEMENT OF TOMORROW. By L. Urwick. Nisbet and Company, Ltd., 22 Berners Street, W. 1, London. 1933. 205pp. $2.25.

NEW FEDERAL ORGANIZATIONS; OUTLINE OF STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONS. By L. F. Schmeckebier. Brookings Institution, 722 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C. 199pp. $1.50.

PERSONALITY IN POLITICS. (Revised edition.) By William B. Munro. Macmillan Company, 60 Fifth Avenue, New York. 121pp. $1.60.

POLITICAL POWER; ITS COMPOSITION AND INCIDENCE. By Charles E. Merriam. McGraw-Hill Book Company, 330 West 42 Street, New York. 331pp. $3.

REPORT OF THE INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE OF UTAH GOVERNMENTAL UNITS. Published by the Committee, State Capitol, Salt Lake City. Variously paged.

REPORT ON THE ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA. By Joint Legislative Committee on Finances, Harrisburg. 687pp.

SOCIAL CHANGE AND THE NEW DEAL. Edited by William F. Ogburn. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. 120pp. $1.

SURVEY OF CONTEMPORARY SOCIOLOGY. By Henry P. Fairchild, ed. Thomas Nelson & Sons, 381 Fourth Avenue, New York. 768pp. $2.50.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT MANUAL. Revised currently. By National Emergency Council, Washington, D. C. 572pp. (Looseleaf.) $2.

UNITS OF GOVERNMENT IN THE UNITED STATES. By William Anderson. Public Administration Service, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 38pp. 50 cents.

## MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT

BOSS RULE: PORTRAITS IN CITY POLITICS. By J. T. Salter. McGraw-Hill Book Company, 330 West 42 Street, New York. In press.

CASES ON MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS. By Murray Seasongood. Callaghan and Company, 401 East Ohio Street, Chicago. 703pp. $6.

CHARTER REVISION FOR THE CITY OF NEW YORK. By Division of Research in Public Administration, New York University, New York. 86pp.

CITY GOVERNMENT IN THE UNITED STATES. By Charles M. Kneier. Harper and Brothers, 49 East 33 Street, New York. 482pp. $3.

CITY PROBLEMS OF 1934. By Paul V. Betters, ed. Proceedings of United States Conference of Mayors, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 1935. 90pp. $2.50.

THE COUNCIL-MANAGER PLAN; RECENT DEVELOPMENTS AND DIRECTORY. By International City Managers' Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 1935. 12pp. 50 cents.

ENGLISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT. By Herman Finer. Columbia University Press, New York. 553pp. $5.50.

---

*Those consulted in the selection of these publications include Lucile L. Keck, Joint Reference Library, Chicago; Dorothy Campbell Culver, Bureau of Public Administration, University of California, Berkeley; the secretariats of several national organizations of public officials; the editorial consultants of *Public Management;* and other experts in special fields. Important publications of 1933 and early 1934 are listed in THE MUNICIPAL YEAR BOOK, 1934. All publications may be ordered from the International City Managers' Association, 850 East 58th Street, Chicago.

The Government of the Metropolitan Area of Detroit. By J. M. Leonard and Lent D. Upson. Michigan Commission of Inquiry into Government, 936 First National Bank Building, Detroit. 121pp.

A Guide for Taxpayers; Ways to Improve Philadelphia's Government. By Bureau of Municipal Research, 311 Juniper Street, Philadelphia. 22pp.

The Law of Municipal Corporations, 1934. Cumulative Supplement, second Edition. By Eugene McQuillan. Callaghan and Company, 401 East Ohio Street, Chicago. 1447pp. $12.

Minnesota Year Book, 1934. By League of Minnesota Municipalities, 16 University Library, Minneapolis. 504pp. $5.

Municipal Administration. By William Bennett Munro. The Macmillan Company, 60 Fifth Avenue, New York. 699pp. $3.75.

Municipal Government in the United States. By Thomas H. Reed. D. Appleton-Century Company, 35 West 32 Street, New York. 418pp. $3.50.

Municipal Index, 1934-35. American City Magazine Corporation, 470 Fourth Avenue, New York. 524pp. $5.

Municipal Problems, 1934. Proceedings of New York Conference of Mayors, City Hall, Albany, New York. 109pp. $1.25.

The Municipal Year Book, 1934. Clarence E. Ridley and Orin F. Nolting, editors. International City Managers' Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 256pp. $4.

Ordinances Regulating the Distribution of Handbills. By American Municipal Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 15pp. 50 cents.

Progress Report of the Los Angeles Committee on Governmental Simplification. By the Committee, 901 Hall of Records, Los Angeles, California. 24pp.

Report of the (Milwaukee) Joint Committee on Consolidation. Published by the Commission, Courthouse, Milwaukee. 78pp.

Report on the Office of the City Clerk in New Haven, Connecticut. By New Haven Taxpayers' Association, 936 Chapel Street, New Haven. 36pp.

Reviving Local Government. You and Your Government Radio Series. Published by National Municipal League, 309 East 34 Street, New York. (Delivered February 13-June 19, 1934, over NBC network.) $1.50.

The Rural Homes of City Workers and the Urban-Rural Migration. By Leland B. Tate. Cornell University Agriculture Experimental Station, Ithaca, New York. 53pp.

Rural-urban Migration in North Carolina 1920 to 1930. By C. Horace Hamilton. North Carolina Agriculture Experimental Station, Raleigh. 85pp.

The Story of the City Manager Plan. Revised Edition. By National Municipal League, 309 East 34 Street, New York. 47pp. 15 cents.

A Survey of the General Civic Conditions of Colorado Cities Having a Population of 2,000 or More. By Edison H. Cramer. Colorado Municipal League, University of Colorado, Boulder. 31pp.

Why Pay Taxes? (Model Report Form for Cities.) By League of Wisconsin Municipalities, 144 North Carroll Street, Madison. 19pp.

## COUNTY GOVERNMENT

Analysis of Pierce County Government. By Pierce County Taxation Bureau, Tacoma, Washington. 1935. 85pp.

California County Expenditures. By J. K. Galbraith. Agricultural Experiment Station, University of California, Berkeley. 108pp.

California County Government. By M. S. Depper and T. S. Dabagh. Bureau of Public Administration, University of California, Berkeley. 1 sheet.

Cost of Administration of County Government in New York City. By J. R. Wilheim. Citizens Budget Commission, 350 Madison Avenue, New York. 261pp.

Counties of Illinois, Their Origin and Evolution. By Edward J. Hughes, Secretary of State, Springfield, Illinois. 67pp.

County Consolidation. By O. W. Campbell. Bureau of Public Administration, University of California, Berkeley. 8pp.

County Reorganization in Texas. By C. A. Jay. Arnold Foundation, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas. 19pp.

The Government of Nassau County. By National Municipal League, 309 East 34 Street, New York. 75pp. $2.

Proceedings of the Institute of Public Affairs. Eighth Annual Session, Athens, Georgia, Round Table on County Government. University of Georgia, Athens. 100pp. $1.50.

Reorganization of County Government in Ohio. By Governor's Commission on County Government, State Capitol, Columbus, Ohio. 190pp.

Report of Progress in County Government, County Consolidation, and the Fee System in Virginia and Other States. By Virginia Commission on County Government, Richmond. House Document No. 9. 31pp.

Township Government in a Pennsylvania County; A Study of the Townships of Chester County. By Pennsylvania Economic Council, Broad and Walnut Streets, Philadelphia. 38pp.

Township Government in Ohio with Particular Reference to Hamilton County. By Cincinnati Bureau of Governmental Research, 619 Gwynne Building, Cincinnati. 1933. 51pp.

Virginia County Conditions and Trends of Social Significance. By William E. Garnett and Aja C. Seymour. Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Virginia. 149pp.

## PERSONNEL

Better Government Personnel. Report of Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel. McGraw-Hill Book Company, 330 West 42 Street, New York. 1935. 182pp. $2.

Bibliography of Civil Service and Personnel Administration. By Sarah Greer. McGraw-Hill Book Company, 330 West 42 Street, New York. 1935. 143pp. (Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel. Monograph 1.) $2.

Civil Service Abroad: Great Britain, Canada, France, Germany. By Leonard D. White, Charles H. Bland, Walter R. Sharp, and Fritz M. Marx. McGraw-Hill Book Company, 330 West 42 Street, New York. 1935. 275pp. $3.

The Emergence of New Public Employment Service. By Jess T. Hopkins. New York State Employment Service, 124 East 28 Street, New York. 345pp. Charts, forms.

Employee Training in Wide-Spread Organizations. By R. O. Beckman. Psychological Corporation, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York. 16pp. 50 cents.

The Employment of Women in Offices. By Ethel Erickson. Women's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 126pp. 15 cents.

Government by Merit. By Lucius Wilmerding, Jr. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 320 West 42 Street, New York. 1935. 150pp. $2.

Laws Relating to Employment Agencies in the United States Enacted in 1933. By U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D. C. 3pp.

Merit System in Illinois, with Special Reference to Chicago and Cook County. By Joseph Pois, Edward M. Martin, Lyman S. Moore. Joint Committee on the Merit System, Suite 900, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago. 1935. 62pp. 15 cents.

Minutes of Evidence. The Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel. McGraw-Hill Book Company, 330 West 42 Street, New York. 1935. 700pp. $6.

Municipal Job Classification and Salary Standardization. T. B. Forbes. New York State Conference of Mayors, City Hall, Albany. 63pp. $1.

Municipal Training Schools in New York. By Albert H. Hall. New York Conference of Mayors, Albany. 112pp. $1.50.

Pay Scales in the California State Service. By Division of Personnel and Organization, State Capitol, Sacramento. 96pp.

Personnel and Salary Trends in Municipal Departments, Minneapolis, 1926-34. By Karleen Fawcett. Taxpayers' Association, 642 McKnight Building, Minneapolis.

Police Pension Fund Investments. By Citizens' Association of Chicago, 77 West Washington Street, Chicago. 23pp.

Policemen's and Firemen's Pension Systems in Indianapolis. By Bureau of Governmental Research, Chamber of Commerce, Indianapolis. 29pp.

Problems of the American Public Service. By Carl Joachim Friedrich, William C. Beyer, Sterling D. Spero, John F. Miller, and George A. Graham. McGraw-Hill Book Company, 330 West 42 Street, New York. 425pp. $4.

Proceedings of 26th Annual Meeting of Civil Service Assembly of United States and Canada. Civil Service Assembly, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 176pp.

A Proposed Plan for an Illinois-Federal Employment Service with Special Reference to Chicago. By Industrial Relations Association of Chicago, 520 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago. 20pp.

Report of Committee on Classification of Positions and Standardization of Salaries. By the Committee, Wayne County, Detroit, Michigan. 103pp.

Report of Conference Committee on Classification of Positions. Board of Supervisors, Wayne County, Detroit, Michigan. Variously paged.

Report of Virginia Fire Instructors' Training School. By League of Virginia Municipalities, Travelers Building, Richmond. 29pp.

Restoration of City Pay Cuts. By American Municipal Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 3pp. 50 cents.

The Results of Workmen's Compensation in Pennsylvania. By John P. Horlacher. Department of Labor and Industry, Harrisburg, 1934. 238pp.

San Francisco Municipal Salaries. By San Francisco Bureau of Governmental Research, 68 Post Street, San Francisco.

Self-Insurance of Workmen's Compensation in Pennsylvania. Howard M. Teaf, Jr. Department of Labor and Industry, Harrisburg, 1934. 176pp.

A Study of the Operation of Civil Service in New Jersey. By New Jersey Taxpayers Association, 517 Broad Street Bank Building, Trenton, New Jersey. 22pp.

Teacher-Retirement Systems. By Ward W. Keesecker. Office of Education, Department of Interior, Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C. Bulletin No. 6. 46pp. 5 cents.

Ten Year Appraisal of the School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse, New York, 1924-34. By Syracuse University. 34pp.

Training Public Employees in Great Britain.

By Harvey Walker. McGraw-Hill Book Company, 330 West 42 Street, New York. 1935. 213pp. $2.50.

## FINANCE

The Bonded Debt of 254 Cities as at January 1, 1934. By C. E. Rightor. National Municipal Review, 309 East 34 Street, New York. 25 cents.

Brief Financial and Administrative Surveys of Cortlandt, Harrison, Mt. Pleasant, New York; and of Winter Park, Florida. By National Municipal League, 309 East 34 Street, New York. $1 each.

The Budget in Governments of Today. By A. E. Buck. Macmillan Company, 60 Fifth Avenue, New York. 349pp. $3.

A Budget Manual for Texas Cities. By Roscoe C. Martin. University of Texas, Austin. 131pp.

Certain Financial Aspects of Local Governments in Maryland. By W. P. Walker. State Planning Commission, 1245 Baltimore Trust Building, Baltimore. 97pp.

Chapters in Public Finance. By Paul Studenski. Ray Long and Richard R. Smith, Inc., 12 East 41 Street, New York. 162pp.

Constructive Economy in Government: You and Your Government Radio Series. Published by National Municipal League, 309 East 34 Street, New York. (Delivered June 20–September 26, 1933, over NBC network.) $1.50.

Cost of Government in the United States, 1923–34. By National Industrial Conference Board, 247 Park Avenue, New York. 46pp. $1.

The Cost of Local Government to the Citizen of Cincinnati. By Bureau of Governmental Research, 619 Gwynne Building, Cincinnati. 59pp.

County Finances in the State of Washington. With Particular Attention to the Financial Problems of County Welfare Activities and Unemployment Relief. By Joseph P. Harris. University of Washington Press, Seattle. 1935. 103pp. $1.

The Crisis in Municipal Finance: You and Your Government Radio Series No. 6. Published by National Municipal League, 309 East 34 Street, New York. 19 lectures. $1.50.

Distribution of Federal Emergency Expenditures. By Richard M. Boeckel. Editorial Research Reports, 839, 17 Street N. W., Washington, D. C. $1.

Federal Aid to States, 1929–33. By R. Dielmann. Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. 64pp.

Federal Municipal Debt Readjustment Act. By Carl H. Chatters and John S. Rae. Public Administration Service, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 12pp. 25 cents.

Final Report of the (Iowa) Interim Committee on Reduction of Governmental Expenditures. Published by the Committee, Des Moines. January 1935. 22pp.

Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of Over 30,000: 1931. By United States Bureau of the Census, Washington, D. C. 499pp. $1.

Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of Over 100,000: 1932. By United States Bureau of the Census, Washington, D. C. 203pp. 75 cents.

Financial Statistics of County Governments in North Dakota. By FERA, Washington, D. C., 1935. Variously paged. Bull. No. 1 of FERA Debt and Financial Survey.

Financial Statistics of State and Local Governments: 1932. By United States Bureau of the Census, Washington, D. C. 69pp. 10 cents.

The Financing of City and Village Government in Wisconsin. By League of Wisconsin Municipalities, 114 North Carroll Street, Madison. 22pp. 25 cents.

Governmental Costs and Taxes in Some Rural New York Towns. By H. M. Haag. Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station, Ithaca, New York. 50pp.

It's Your Money. By Barnet Hodes. Reilly & Lee Company, 325 West Huron Street, Chicago. 218pp. $1.

Maintaining Municipal Solvency. By H. F. Long. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C. 12pp.

Mandatory Expenditures of Local Governments in Pennsylvania. By Edward W. Carter. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. 189pp.

Municipal Scrip; A Report of Experience. By American Municipal Association and Municipal Finance Officers' Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 17pp. 25 cents.

New Sources of Municipal Revenue. By A. M. Hillhouse. Municipal Finance Officers' Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 1935. 74pp. $1.

A Program for the Economical Operation of the City of Toledo for 1935. By Commission of Publicity and Efficiency, Safety Building, Toledo. 30pp.

Report on a Study of the Financial and Tax Problems of Municipal Governments in New Jersey. By Senate Committee on Taxation, Trenton. 50pp.

Reports on the Financial Condition of Yonkers and Mt. Vernon, New York. By National Municipal League, 309 East 34 Street, New York. 23pp. $2 each.

A Revenue System for Texas Cities. By J. T. Barton. Bureau of Research in the Social Sciences, University of Texas, Austin. 1935. 93pp.

State and Local Budgetary Methods. By Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C. 1935. 32pp.

A Study of Revenue Receipts and Governmental Cost Payments of Counties, Cities, and School Districts of Ohio for the Years 1929–1933. By Research Section, Tax Commission of Ohio, Columbus. 1935. Variously paged.

Survey of the Financial Situation of the City of Enterprise, Oregon. By Charles McKinley and C. W. Ham. League of Oregon Cities, Eugene. 115pp. Mimeographed tables, charts. $1. With pictures, $3.50.

Waste in Local Government. By H. S. Hicks, First National Bank Building, Rockford, Illinois. 1935. 24pp.

Westchester County and Local Divisions of Government: A Study of Overlapping Debt. By H. J. Frey. Municipal Service Department, Dun & Bradstreet, 290 Broadway, New York. 22pp. $2.

## ACCOUNTING

Accounting for the Sinking Fund Trust of the County of Hamilton. By Cincinnati Bureau of Governmental Research, Gwynne Building, Cincinnati. 17pp.

A Bibliography of Municipal Accounting. By National Committee on Municipal Accounting, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 14pp. 25 cents.

Manual of Financial and Accounting Procedure for Public Bodies. By Federal PWA, Washington, D. C. (Free to officials on request from Public Administration Service, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago.) 87pp.

Mechanical Aids in Tax Accounting, City of Newark, New Jersey. By H. G. Fishack and Loren B. Miller. Citizens' Advisory Finance Committee, 830 Broad Street, Newark, New Jersey. 24pp.

A Municipal General Ledger and Principal Supporting Records. By Walter O. Harris. Municipal Finance Officers' Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 44pp. 50 cents.

Recording Procedure and Forms in Philadelphia Bureau of Weights and Measures. By Pennsylvania Economic Council, Broad and Walnut, Philadelphia. 33pp.

Special Report on Municipal Accounts by the State Comptroller. By New York State Department of Audit and Control, Albany. 347pp. $6.

A System of Cost and Expense Accounting for Public Institutions of the City of Cincinnati and County of Hamilton. By Cincinnati Bureau of Governmental Research, Gwynne Building, Cincinnati. 84pp.

Tentative Outline of a Suggested Procedure for a Detailed Municipal Audit. By National Committee on Municipal Accounting, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 26pp. $1.

## PURCHASING

Shall the City of Indianapolis Establish a Central Storeroom? By Bureau of Governmental Research, Chamber of Commerce, Indianapolis, Indiana. 1935. 23pp.

Sources of Supply of Commodities Covered by Commercial Standards. Two Publications, Dated October 1 and December 1, 1934. National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce, Washington. 145pp. and 57pp.

A Survey of the Terms Used in Designating Qualities of Goods. By Consumers' Advisory Board, NRA, Washington, D. C. 59pp.

## TAXATION AND ASSESSMENTS

Appraising Residential Property. Methods, Cost Data, and Instructions Helpful to Assessors. By C. E. Reeves, 2202 Liberty Bank Building, Buffalo, New York. 100pp. $2.

Assessing Land and Improvements. By Tax Policy League, 309 East 34 Street, New York. 14pp. 30 cents.

Assessments of Real Estate and Personal Property in Cook County, Illinois. By J. L. Jacobs. Cook County Assessor, County Building, Chicago. 178pp.

The City Real Estate Tax in Pittsburgh. By J. P. Watson. Bureau of Business Research, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh. 108pp. $1.

City Sharing in Special Motor Taxes. By American Municipal Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 37pp. $1.

The Collection of Taxes Levied on Real and Personal Property in Wisconsin, as of March 1, 1935. By Philip Habermann. League of Wisconsin Municipalities, 114 North Carroll Street, Madison. 1935. 14pp. 25 cents.

Comparative Tax Rates for 261 Cities, 1934. By C. E. Rightor. National Municipal League, 309 East 34 Street, New York. 14pp. 25 cents.

Constitutional Tax Rate Limitation for Illinois. By Illinois Tax Commission, 33 North LaSalle Street, Chicago. 152pp.

A Description of the English System for the Taxation of Real Property on an Income Basis. By Rosina K. Mohaupt and Alger W. Lenz. Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research, 936 First National Bank Building, Detroit. 22pp.

The Exemption from Taxation of Privately Owned Real Property Used for Religious, Charitable and Educational Purposes in New York State. By C. J. Tobin and L. L. Tolman. Charles J. Tobin, 100 State Street, Albany, New York. 111pp. $1.

Estimates of Revenue Yield from a Gross Income Tax and Various Types of Sales Taxes for the State of Minnesota. By Minnesota Institute of Governmental Research, First National Bank Building, St. Paul. 1935. 19pp.

FEASIBILITY OF BLANKET TAX LIMITATION LAWS ON GENERAL PROPERTY IN MINNESOTA. By Minnesota Institute of Governmental Research, First National Bank Building, St. Paul. 24pp.

THE FIVE-YEAR TREND IN TAX DELINQUENCY 1930–34; CITIES OVER 50,000 POPULATION. By Frederick L. Bird. Dun and Bradstreet, Municipal Service Department, 290 Broadway, New York. 1935. 24pp.

FORECLOSURE OF PROPERTY IN MANHATTAN, 1928–34. By John E. Burton. Institute for Economic Research, 551 Fifth Avenue, New York. 24pp.

THE GASOLINE TAX IN THE UNITED STATES. By Finla G. Crawford. Public Administration Service, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 1935. 46pp. 50 cents.

HOW SHOULD CITIES SHARE IN SPECIAL MOTOR TAXES? By National Highway Users Conference, Washington, D. C. 15pp. 25 cents.

HOW TO IMPROVE MUNICIPAL TAX COLLECTION. By State Bureau of Municipal Information, New York State Conference of Mayors, Albany. 14pp.

ILLINOIS ASSESSORS' MANUAL, 1935. By State Tax Commission, Springfield, Illinois. 222pp.

INDIRECT TAXES, SHARING THE COSTS OF GOVERNMENT. By Bureau for Government Research, West Virginia University, Morgantown. 45pp.

INHERITANCE TAXES. By Glen R. Treavor and Roy G. Blakey. League of Minnesota Municipalities, Minneapolis. 1935. 47pp. 50 cents.

A MANUAL OF TAX COLLECTION PROCEDURE FOR TEXAS CITIES. Lyndon E. Abbott. University of Texas, Austin. 1935. 107pp.

PAY YOUR TAXES. By National Municipal League, 309 East 34 Street, New York. 11pp.

PRACTICE OF CERTAIN MUNICIPALITIES IN ALLOWING DISCOUNTS FOR THE PRE-PAYMENT OF TAXES. By Abbett Pulliam. Bureau of Municipal Research, Schenectady, New York. 12pp.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE TAX ADMINISTRATORS, INDIANAPOLIS. Published by the Association, Indianapolis, Indiana. 154pp.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE 26TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON TAXATION UNDER AUSPICES OF NATIONAL TAX ASSOCIATION, PHOENIX, ARIZONA, 1935. Edited by W. G. Query. National Tax Association, State Office Building, Columbia, South Carolina, 486pp. $3.50.

THE PROVIDENCE TAX DEPARTMENT. By Governmental Research Bureau, 57 Eddy Street, Providence, Rhode Island. 27pp.

REALTY TAX DELINQUENCY: v. 1, CURRENT TAX DELINQUENCY BY STATES AND COUNTIES; v. 2, URBAN TAX DELINQUENCY. By United States Bureau of the Census, Washington, D. C. 2 volumes Mimeo.

REBUILDING IN WEST VIRGINIA; FIFTEEN MONTHS OF LEGISLATION (1933–34). By John F. Sly. Bureau for Government Research, West Virginia University, Morgantown. 21pp.

RECENT FISCAL POLICIES OF CERTAIN STATES. By Tax Policy League, 309 East 34 Street, New York. 1935. 38pp. 50 cents.

RECENT GROSS SALES TAX POLICY IN THE LIGHT OF EXPERIENCE. By James W. Martin. Interstate Commission on Conflicting Taxation, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 12pp.

RELATION OF STATE SALES TAXES TO CITIES. By American Municipal Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 3pp. 15 cents.

REPORT OF THE CONNECTICUT TEMPORARY COMMISSION TO STUDY THE TAX LAWS OF THE STATE AND TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THEIR REVISION. Published by the State. 642pp.

REPORT OF THE OREGON COMMITTEE ON ASSESSMENT AND TAXATION OF MUNICIPAL UTILITIES. By the Committee, State Capitol, Salem, Oregon. 40pp.

SALES OR GROSS INCOME TAXES, ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST. By Minnesota Institute of Governmental Research, First National Bank Building, St. Paul. 1935. 30pp.

THE SALES TAX; ANALYSIS OF EXISTING LAWS AND OF THE EXPERIENCE OF OTHER STATES WITH SPECIAL APPLICATION TO KANSAS. By Jens P. Jensen. Kansas Legislative Council, Topeka. 97pp.

THE SALES TAX IN THE AMERICAN STATES. By Robert Murray Haig and Carl Shoup. Columbia University Press, Morningside Heights, New York. 833pp. $4.50.

SALES TAX LAWS; COMPLETE TEXTS OF STATE SALES TAX AND GROSS INCOME TAX LAWS. By Commerce Clearing House, 205 West Monroe Street, Chicago. 211pp. $1.

SALES TAX REVENUES. By Interstate Reference Bureau, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 12pp. 35 cents.

SALES TAXES. By Carl L. Nelson and Gladys C. and Roy G. Blakey. League of Minnesota Municipalities, Minneapolis. 1935. 88pp. $1.

SALES TAXES, GENERAL AND RETAIL. Compiled by Daniel Bloomfield. H. W. Wilson Company, 958 University Avenue, New York. 241pp. 90 cents.

SALES TAXES: STATE VS. FEDERAL. By American Legislators Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 1935. 49pp.

SHARING TAXES WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENTS. By General Welfare Tax League, 309 East 34 Street, New York. 9pp. 25 cents.

A STUDY OF TAX DELINQUENCY IN THE SECOND WARD OF DETROIT WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO APARTMENT HOUSE PROPERTIES. Virginia L. Eyre. Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research, Inc., 936 National Bank Building, Detroit. 22pp.

A Study of the Tax Exemption Policy in New Jersey. By New Jersey Taxpayers Association, Broad Street Bank Building, Trenton. 15pp.

Tax Delinquency. By Tax Policy League, 309 East 34 Street, New York. 13pp. 25 cents.

Tax Limitation in West Virginia. By John F. Sly and George A. Shipman. Bureau for Government Research, West Virginia University, Morgantown. 38pp.

A Tax Policy for the United States. By Harold M. Groves. New Republic, 421 West 21 Street, New York. 41pp. 25 cents.

The Tax Problem of the State Government of Missouri. By Civic Research Institute, 114 West 10 Street, Kansas City, Missouri. 38pp.

A Tax Revenue Program for the State of New York. By New York State Commission for the Revision of the Tax Laws, Albany. 1935. Fifth Report. 78pp.

Tax Systems of the World. By Tax Research Foundation. Commerce Clearing House, 205 West Monroe Street, Chicago. $9.

Taxation of Real Property in Pennsylvania. By Edward B. Logan. Budget Office, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. 134pp.

Wisconsin Taxes; Where They Come from and Where They Go. By Wisconsin Taxpayers Alliance, Madison. 72pp.

## CITY AND REGIONAL PLANNING

American Civic Annual. By Harlean James, ed. American Civic Association, Inc., 901 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. 278pp. $3.

Circular Letters, Numbers 6-13. By National Planning Board, Washington, D. C. (No. 11 is Status of City and Regional Planning in the United States.) 70pp.

Circulars of the National Resources Board, No. 1-4. The Board, Washington, D. C., August 1934 to date.

City Planning and Zoning, In Relation to Fire Prevention and Fire Protection. By National Fire Protection Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston. 39pp. 50 cents.

Comprehensive Planning for the Development of Illinois; a Preliminary Report on State Planning. By Jacob L. Crane, Jr. Illinois Chamber of Commerce, 20 West Wacker Drive, Chicago. 53pp.

County Zoning in Wisconsin. By Walter A. Rowlands. College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin, Madison. 13pp.

Final Report, 1933–34, National Planning Board. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 119 pp. 25 cents.

Langlade County: a Survey of National Resources and Their Utilization. By Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin. 64pp.

A Manual of County Planning. By California County Planning Commissioners' Association and State Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco. 30pp.

Model Laws for Planning Cities, Counties, and States. By E. M. Bassett, F. B. Williams, Alfred Bettman, Robert Whitten. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts. 1935. 137pp. $2.50.

Outline of Town and City Planning. By Thomas Adams. Russell Sage Foundation, 122 East 22 Street, New York. 1935. 368pp. $3.

A Preliminary Report on State Planning. By State Planning Commission, Lansing, Michigan. 1935. Unpaged.

Preliminary Report of Progress. By Iowa State Planning Board. P. H. Elwood, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa. 507pp.

Preliminary Report on a State Plan for Indiana. By Indiana State Planning Board, Indianapolis. 163pp.

Preliminary Report to the National Resources Board. By Pennsylvania State Planning Board, Harrisburg. 682pp.

Progress Report, April 6, 1934 to December 31, 1934. By Florida State Planning Board, Tallahassee. 1935. 85pp.

Report of Minnesota State Planning Board. Part 1. The Board, St. Paul. 75pp.

Report of National Resources Board on National Planning and Public Works in Relation to Natural Resources and Including Land Use and Water Resources with Finding and Recommendations. Published by Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 455pp. $3.25.

Report of the Mississippi Valley Committee. By the Committee. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 234pp.

Report on Civil Works Administration Project No. 3512. By Boston City Planning Board. 296pp. Pt. 1, Housing Studies; pt. 2, Engineering Studies; pt. 3, Landscape Studies.

Report on the Income and Cost of Six Districts in the City of Boston. City Planning Board, Boston. December 1934. 44pp.

State Plan for Missouri; A Preliminary Report. By Missouri State Planning Board, Jefferson City. 87pp. $1.

State Planning for New York; Summary Report of Progress. By New York State Planning Board, Albany. 92pp.

Technical Procedure for City Surveys. By Committee of the Surveying and Mapping, American Society of Civil Engineers, 33 West 39 Street, New York. 125pp. 95 cents to members, $1.90 to non-members.

Tennessee Valley Authority; Annual Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1934. Published by the Authority, Washington, D. C. 1935. 60pp. 10 cents.

Town and City Zoning and Planning Primer.

By New Hampshire State Planning Board. State Development Commission, Concord, New Hampshire. 31pp.

Zoning Manual for Wisconsin Cities and Villages. By A. J. Rabuck, League of Wisconsin Municipalities, 114 North Carroll Street, Madison. 16pp. 50 cents.

(See also Housing; Parks and Recreation; Public Works)

## ELECTIONS

The Cost of Registrations and Elections in St. Louis, 1923–34. By Bureau of Municipal Research, Paul Brown Building, St. Louis. 1935. 11pp. and tables.

Dishonest Elections and Why We Have Them. By Women's Civil Council of the Chicago Area, 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago. 81pp.

Election Administration in Michigan. By James Kerr Pollock. National Municipal League, 309 East 34 Street, New York. 35pp. 25 cents.

A Manual for City Election Officials in Wisconsin. By Clarence R. Jirtle. League of Wisconsin Municipalities, 114 North Carroll Street, Madison. 14pp. 1935. 25 cents.

Permanent Registration in Michigan. By James K. Pollock. Michigan Municipal League, Ann Arbor. 16pp. 50 cents.

Registration and Voting in Kansas City. By Civic Research Institute, 114 West 10 Street, Kansas City, Missouri. 28pp.

## POLICE

Bibliography of Crime and Criminal Justice, 1927–1931. Compiled by Dorothy Campbell Culver. Bureau of Public Administration, University of California. H. W. Wilson Co., 958 University Avenue, New York. 413pp. $12.

Classification and Uses of Finger Prints. By E. R. Henry. H. M. Stationery Office, Adastral House, Kingsway London, W. C.2 (seventh edition) 142pp. 3s.

Detection of Crime. By W. M. Else and J. M. Garrow. Police Journal, 69 Great Russell Street, London. 195pp. May be purchased through Public Administration Service, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 6 shillings.

Draft of an Act Creating a State Bureau of Criminal Identification, Investigation, and Statistics. By E. W. Puttkamer and Donald C. Stone. Committee on Uniform Crime Records, International Association of Chiefs and Police, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 14pp.

Extending Federal Powers Over Crime. In October Issue of "Law and Contemporary Problems" by School of Law, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina. 133pp. 60 cents.

A Federal - State - Municipal - Co-operative Police System. By Eugene E. Smith. Crayden Publishing Company, Portland, Oregon. 26pp. 25 cents.

Fingerprints: Fingerprinting Living and Deceased Individuals, Latent Fingerprints, Court Decisions. By Division of Investigation, U. S. Department of Justice. 28pp.

Identification of Firearms. By J. D. and C. O. Gunther. John Wiley & Sons, 440 Fourth Avenue, New York, 1935. 342pp. $4.

Identification of Firearms and Forensic Ballistics. By Gerald Burrard. Herbert Jenkins, Ltd., 3, York Street, St. James, London, S. W. 1. 220pp. 12s, 6d.

Modern Criminal Investigation. By Harry Soderman and John J. O'Connell. Funk & Wagnalls, 354 Fourth Avenue, New York. $3.

Municipal Police Radio Systems. United States Conference of Mayors, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 50pp. $1.

Organization and Administration of a Municipal Police Department. By Richard W. Morris. New York State Conference of Mayors, City Hall, Albany. 47pp.

Outline of Instruction, Police Training School, 1934. By League of Kansas Municipalities, Lawrence. 72pp. $4.

Papers Presented at the Short Course on Police Administration, Ohio State University, 1934. Apply to Harvey Walker, Department of Political Science, Ohio State University, Columbus. 5pts. 25 cents each, $1 set.

Police Administration in Boston. By Leonard V. Harrison. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts. 203pp. $2.50.

The Police School, Louisville, Kentucky. By Dunlap Wakefield, Director of Safety, Louisville, Kentucky. 20pp.

Police Training in New York State; Report of Operation of Twelve Municipal Training Schools During 1933. Published by New York State Conference of Mayors, Albany. 15pp.

Proceedings of 41st annual Convention of International Association of Chiefs of Police. George Black, Secretary, City Hall, Wilmington, Delaware. 1935. 236pp.

Report of the Massachusetts Special Crime Commission. The Commission, State House, Boston. 223pp.

Science and the Police Officer. By Henry T. F. Rhodes. London Police Chronicle, London, England. 196pp. 5 shillings.

Scotland Yard. (2nd edition.) By Sir John Moylan. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 24 Bedford Street, Strand, London. 416pp. 7s, 6d.

State Police. By League of Kansas Municipalities, Lawrence. 43pp. $2.50.

State Police. By Milton Chernin. Bureau of

Public Administration, University of California, Berkeley. 23pp.

State Police: Analysis of Existing Laws and of Experience of other States with Special Application to Kansas. By Kansas Legislative Council, Topeka. 84pp.

A State Police Act. By Public Administration Service, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 1935. 16pp. 25 cents.

Survey of the Bureau of Police, Portland, Oregon. By Police Survey Commission, Portland. 139pp.

What Policemen Should Know: A Book for Police Officers of All Ranks. By J. J. Skehan. Police Journal, 1123 Broadway, New York. 387pp. $2.

(See also Administration of Justice; Public Welfare)

## PUBLIC WELFARE AND RELIEF

Administration of the Old Age Pension System in Marion County, Indiana. By Bureau of Governmental Research, Chamber of Commerce, Indianapolis. 24pp.

The Co-ordinating Council Plan. In the "Commonwealth," Hotel St. Francis, San Francisco. 17pp.

County Welfare Organization in Pennsylvania. By Public Charities Association of Pennsylvania, 311 South Juniper Street, Philadelphia. 7pp.

Digest of Relief Legislation (financial) in the Various States Since January 1, 1933. By Division of Research and Statistics, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Washington, D. C. 12pp.

Federal Transient Program; an Evaluative Survey. By Ellery F. Reed. Committee on Care of Transients and Homeless, 1270 Sixth Avenue, New York. 143pp.

Group Treatment for Transients. By Robert S. Wilson and Dorothy de la Pole. National Association for Travelers Aid and Transient Service, 1270 Sixth Avenue, New York. 155pp.

The Incidence of Delinquency in Berkeley, 1928–1932. By Herman Adler and others. University of California Press, Berkeley, 1934. 102pp. $2.

Individualized Service for Transients. By Robert S. Wilson. National Association of Travelers Aid Societies, 25 West 43 Street, New York. 79pp.

Looking Toward a Public Welfare Plan. By Russell H. Kurtz. Russell Sage Foundation, 130 East 22 Street, New York. 1935. 34pp. 25 cents.

Making Relief Respectable: A Radical Reconstruction of Our Conception of Public Relief. By Homer Folks. State Charities Aid Association, 105 East 22 Street, New York. 16pp.

The Madison Community. (A Social Survey.) By Kimball Young and others. University of Wisconsin, Madison. 229pp. $1.50.

The Ohio Poor Law and Its Administration. By Aileen E. Kennedy and S. P. Breckinridge. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. 233pp. $2.

Old Age Pension Laws. By American Public Welfare Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 26pp. 20 cents.

One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents. By Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts. 341pp. $3.50.

Organization for Social Welfare. By George B. Mangold. Macmillan Company, 60 Fifth Avenue, New York. 494pp. $3.50.

Personnel, Philosophy, and Practice in Family Case Work. By Family Welfare Association, 130 East 22 Street, New York. 20pp. 25 cents.

Poor Relief Administration in Pennsylvania. By State Department of Welfare, Harrisburg, 1934. 303pp.

Proceedings of National Conference of Social Work, May 20-26, 1934. University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago. 621pp. $3.

Public Relief for Veterans in New York State Cities. By Fred Levi. New York State Conference of Mayors, City Hall, Albany. 185pp. $1.50.

Public Welfare Function of Government in Virginia. By Arthur W. James. State Department of Public Welfare, Richmond, Virginia. 88pp.

Public Welfare Service in Kansas; A Ten-Year Report 1924-33. The Kansas Emergency Relief Committee, Topeka, Kansas. 628pp. $5.

Public Welfare in Washington. By Mildred E. Buck. Washington State Planning Council, Olympia, Washington. 138pp. 25 cents.

Quantity and Cost Budgets for (San Francisco) Family of an Executive; of a Clerk; of a Wage Earner; Dependent Families or Children. By Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics, University of California, Berkeley. 58pp. 30 cents.

The Quest for Security. By I. M. Rubinow. Henry Holt & Company, 1 Park Avenue, New York. 638pp. $3.50.

Regulations Governing Medical Care Provided Recipients of Home Relief. By New York State TERA, 79 Madison Avenue, New York. 50pp.

Relief to the Needy Aged; A Summary of Assistance Laws in the United States and Abroad. By Frances Cahn. Bureau of Public Administration, University of California, Berkeley. 15pp.

Report of (Oregon) Governor's Interim Commission on Public Health and Welfare.

Published by the Commission, Portland. 24pp.

Report of the County Survey Advisory Committee. By Council of Social Agencies of Buffalo and Erie County, Buffalo, New York. 58pp. 20 cents.

Report to the President of the Committee on Economic Security. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 1935. 53pp., and Supplement 18pp.

Social Security in the United States, 1934: A Record of the Seventh National Conference. By American Association for Social Security, 22 East 17 Street, New York. 193pp. $1.75.

Social Welfare in the National Recovery Program. By Academy of Political and Social Science, 3457 Walnut Street, Philadelphia. 269pp. $2.

Stabilization of Employment in Virginia and Building Up of Unemployment Reserves. Published by Division of Purchase and Printing, Richmond. 157pp.

Standards of Relief in Selected Cities of the United States, 1933. By Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics, University of California, Berkeley. 18pp. 25 cents.

State Welfare Administration in New Jersey. By Paul Tutt Stafford. Department of Institutions and Agencies, State Capitol, Trenton, New Jersey. 136pp.

A Study of the Public Welfare Work in New Jersey. By New Jersey Taxpayers Association, 517 Broad Street, Bank Building, Trenton. 24pp. 25 cents.

A Tabular Summary of State Laws Relating to Public Aid to Children in Their Own Homes in Effect January 1, 1934. By U. S. Children's Bureau, Washington, D. C. 39pp. 10 cents.

The Technique of Social Investigation. By C. Luther Fry. Harper & Brothers, 49 East 33 Street, New York. 315pp. $2.50.

Twelve and One-Half Million Registered for Work, 1934. By United States Employment Service, Department of Labor, Washington, D. C. 1935. 98pp.

Unemployment and Relief in Michigan. State Emergency Welfare Relief Commission, Lansing. 150pp.

Unemployment Relief and Rehabilitation; Two Proposals: The "Ohio Plan" and the Self-help Cooperatives. By Dean E. McHenry. Bureau of Public Administration, University of California, Berkeley. 17pp.

Unemployment Relief in Virginia. By League of Virginia Municipalities, Travelers Building, Richmond. 16pp. 20 cents.

Volume, Distribution, and Cost of Child Dependency in New York State. By James H. Foster and Robert Axel. Department of Social Welfare, Albany. 69pp.

Volunteer Values. By Ruth M. Dodd. Family Welfare Association, 130 East 22 Street, New York. 43pp. 30 cents.

Welfare, Relief, and Recovery Legislation for 1933–1934. By Marietta Stevenson and Susan B. Posanski. Public Administration Service, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 36pp. 25 cents.

Work Relief in Germany. By Hertha Kraus. Russell Sage Foundation, 130 East 22 Street, New York. 93pp. 50 cents.

Workmen's Compensation for Work Relief Employees of Cities. By American Municipal Association and American Public Welfare Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 17pp. 25 cents.

Yearbook of the National Probation Association. Published by the Association, 450 Seventh Avenue, New York. 232pp. $1.50.

(See also Administration of Justice and Public Health)

## PARKS AND RECREATION

The Challenge of Leisure. By Arthur Newton Pack. Macmillan Company, 60 Fifth Avenue, New York. 244pp. $2.

Community Recreation in 1933. Recreation Year Book. By National Recreation Association, 315 Fourth Avenue, New York. 50 cents.

Financing Municipal Recreation. By Randolph O. Huus. George Banta Publishing Company, Menasha, Wisconsin. 1935. 249pp. $2.50.

Leisure: A Suburban Study. By George A. Lundberg and others. Columbia University Press, New York. 396pp. $3.

The Leisure Hours of 5,000 People: A Report of a Study of Leisure Time Activities and Desires. By National Recreation Association, 315 Fourth Avenue, New York. 83pp. $1.

Nature's Plan for Parks and Parkways; Recreational Lands in the Philadelphia Tri-State District. Regional Planning Federation, 1420 Walnut Street, Philadelphia. 36pp.

The New Leisure Challenges the Schools. By Eugene T. Lies. National Recreation Association, 315 Fourth Avenue, New York. 326pp. $2.

Radburn; A Plan of Living. By Robert B. Hudson and John O. Walker. American Association for Adult Education, 60 East 42 Street, New York. 118pp. $1.25.

Recreation for Girls and Women. By Ethel Bowers. National Recreation Association, 315 Fourth Avenue, New York. 425pp. $3.

Recreational Uses of Land in Connecticut. By N. L. Whetten and V. A. Rapport. Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, Storrs. 80pp.

Report of the New York Committee on the Use of Leisure Time, National Recovery Administration. By The Committee, 61 Broadway, New York. 96pp.

Space Requirements for the Children's Playground. By National Recreation Association, 315 Fourth Avenue, New York. 24pp. 40 cents.

## HOUSING

Analysis of a Slum Area in Cleveland. By Robert B. Navin, et al. The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. 96pp.

Demolition of Unsafe and Insanitary Housing. By National Association of Housing Officials, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 35pp. 25 cents.

The Design of Residential Areas. By Thomas Adams. Harvard University Press, Cambridge. Harvard City Planning Studies VI. 296pp. $3.50.

The Economics of Shelter. By Albert Farwell Bemis. Institute of Technology Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts. 605pp. $4.

Housing Conditions in America as Revealed by the Real Property Inventory. By Nathanael H. Engle. U. S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C. 32pp.

Housing in Philadelphia. By Bernard J. Newman. Philadelphia Housing Association, 1600 Walnut Street, Philadelphia. 38pp. 25 cents.

Housing Officials' Year Book. By National Association of Housing Officials, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 1935. 80pp. $1.

A Housing Program. By John Ihlder. By Washington Committee on Housing, 902 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. 22pp.

A Housing Program for the United States. By National Association of Housing Officials, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 22pp. Free.

The Housing Program of the City of Vienna. By Charles O. Hardy and Robert Kuczynski. Brookings Institution, 722 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C. 143pp. $2.

Housing Survey. By Dayton City Plan Board. Harold E. Winey, Secretary-Engineer, Dayton, Ohio. 95pp.

Low-Cost Housing and Slum Clearance. In Law and Contemporary Problems, School of Law, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina. 60 cents.

A Measuring Rule for Housing Projects. By John Ihlder. Washington Committee on Housing, 902 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. 8pp. 5 cents.

Modern Housing. By Catherine Bauer. Houghton-Mifflin Company, 2 Park Street, Boston. 331pp. $5.

New Homes for a New Deal. By Albert Mayer, Henry Wright, and Lewis Mumford. The New Republic, 421 West 21 Street, New York. 46pp. 25 cents.

Practices and Experiences of the Lavanburg Homes. Fred L. Lavanburg Foundation, 90 John Street, New York. 16pp.

The Real Property Inventory. By Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C. (Set of reports for 64 cities and general summary, $5.)

Regulations for Mortgage Insurance under Title II of the National Housing Act. Federal Housing Administration, Washington, D. C. 5 circulars. Free.

The Relation Between Housing and Health. By Rollo H. Britten. Public Health Reports, Vol. 49, No. 44. Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C. 13pp. 5 cents.

Report of the New York State Board of Housing. (Doc. No. 41), 80 Centre Street, New York. 62pp.

Report of the Slum Clearance Study Committee, on the Preliminary Survey of Housing Conditions in Slum Areas for the Purpose of Laying out a Slum Clearance and Rehousing Program. By the Committee, Hartford, Connecticut. 52pp.

Toward Fuller Living Through Public Housing and Leisure Time Activities. By Abraham Goldfeld. National Public Housing Conference, 112 East 19 Street, New York. 55pp. 25 cents.

(See also City and Regional Planning)

## PUBLIC HEALTH

The Hospital Yearbook. By Modern Hospital Publishing Company, 919 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago. 543pp. $2.50.

Medical Care During the Depression. A Preliminary Report Based on Survey in Seven Large Cities. By Perrott, Sydenstricker, and Collins. Milbank Memorial Fund, 49 Wall Street, New York. 16pp.

Medical Care for the Unemployed and Their Families Under the Plan of the FERA. By the American Public Welfare Association. 850 East 58 Street. 28pp. Free.

Milk Sanitation Ratings of Cities. By United States Public Health Service, Washington, D. C. Reprint Number 1610, Public Health Reports, 5pp. tables. 5 cents.

Papers of Charles V. Chapin, M.D.; A Review of Public Health Realities. Selected by Frederic P. Gorham and edited by Clarence L. Scamman, M.D. The Commonwealth Fund, 41 East 57 Street, New York. 268pp. $1.50.

The Patient in Hospital and Clinic: A Study of Duplication in Care and Ability to Pay. By Joint Committee on Research, Pennsylvania School of Social Work and the

Community Council of Philadelphia, 311 South Juniper Street, Philadelphia. 17pp.

PROBLEMS OF HEALTH CONSERVATION. Proceedings, 12th Conference of Council of Milbank Memorial Fund, 49 Wall Street, New York. 109pp.

RECORDING OF LOCAL HEALTH WORK. By W. F. Walker and Carolina R. Randolph. The Commonwealth Fund, 41 East 57 Street, New York. In press. $2.

## FIRE ADMINISTRATION

ADEQUATE FIRE DEPARTMENT RECORDS. By National Fire Protection Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston, Massachusetts. 4pp.

BASIC SALARIES THAT PREVAIL IN FIRE DEPARTMENTS. By International Fire Fighter, American Federation of Labor Building, Washington, D. C. 8pp. (tables) $1.

BUILDING EXITS CODE. 3rd Edition. By National Fire Protection Association. 75 cents.

CITY PLANNING AND ZONING, IN RELATION TO FIRE PREVENTION AND FIRE PROTECTION. By National Fire Protection Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston. 39pp. 50 cents.

FIRE HOSE COUPLINGS AND FIRE DEPARTMENT HOSE CONNECTIONS. By National Fire Protection Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston.

FIRE INSURANCE CLASSIFICATION OF CITIES AND FIRE LOSSES. By Harold A. Stone. Public Administration Service, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 25pp. 50 cents.

A KEY TO STATE LAWS AND REGULATIONS ON FIRE PROTECTION AND FIRE PREVENTION. By National Fire Protection Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston. $1.

MANUAL OF FIRE-LOSS PREVENTION OF THE FEDERAL FIRE COUNCIL. By National Bureau of Standards, U. S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C. 156pp. 20 cents.

MODEL FUMIGATION ORDINANCE. By National Fire Protection Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston. 10 cents.

MUNICIPAL FIRE ALARM SYSTEMS. By National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York. 47pp.

PROCEEDINGS OF 38TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL FIRE PROTECTION ASSOCIATION, 1934. By National Fire Protection Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston. 399pp.

REDUCING BOSTON'S FIRE DEPARTMENT COSTS, BY THE ELIMINATION OF FOUR ENGINE COMPANIES AND TWO LADDER COMPANIES. By Boston Municipal Research Bureau, 1 Court Street, Boston. 25pp. 50 cents. Also, SUPPLEMENTARY MEMORANDUM ON REDUCING BOSTON'S FIRE DEPARTMENT COSTS. 23pp.

RURAL FIRE DEPARTMENTS, EQUIPMENT AND ORGANIZATION. By National Fire Protection Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston. 16pp. 10 cents.

THE STANDARD DRILL MANUAL. By Robert B. Rogers, Seattle Fire Department, Seattle, Washington. 121pp. $1.

SUGGESTED ORDINANCE ON OIL BURNING EQUIPMENT. By National Fire Protection Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston. 10 cents.

SURVEY AND REPORT ON THE PROVIDENCE FIRE DEPARTMENT. By Governmental Research Bureau, 57 Eddy Street, Providence, Rhode Island. 48pp.

THE VOLUNTEER FIRE COMPANY. By William Draper Brinckloe. By National Fire Protection Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston. 168pp. $1.

## PUBLIC WORKS

AIRPORTS AND ESTABLISHED LANDING FIELDS IN THE UNITED STATES. Airport Directory Company, Hackensack, New Jersey. 1935. 192pp. $3.

AUTOMOBILE JUNK YARDS AND GRAVEYARDS. By American Municipal Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 20pp. 50 cents.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS IN THE UNITED STATES. By United States Bureau of Air Commerce, Washington, D. C. 54pp.

CONSTRUCTION COSTS, 1910–1933. Published by Engineering News-Record, 330 West 42 Street, New York. 96pp. $1.

DESCRIPTIONS OF AIRPORTS AND LANDING FIELDS IN THE UNITED STATES. By United States Department of Commerce. Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C. 228pp.

HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION IN TEXAS. By Frank M. Stewart. University of Texas, Austin. 211pp.

LOCAL PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION IN MICHIGAN. By Roger L. Morrison and others. Michigan Commission of Inquiry into Government, 936 First National Bank Building, Detroit. 15pp. 5 cents.

MAINTENANCE GUARANTEES IN PAVEMENT CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS. By American Municipal Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 26pp. $1.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC WORKS INVENTORY AND PROGRAM. State Planning Commission, Lansing. 1935.

MUNICIPAL OPERATION OF CEMETERIES. By North Carolina League of Municipalities, Capitol Club Building, Raleigh. 12pp.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF HIGHWAY OFFICIALS OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC STATES. State House Annex, Trenton, New Jersey. 242pp.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE TWENTIETH ANNUAL HIGHWAY CONFERENCE. Published by University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. 152pp.

PUBLIC CLEANSING SERVICE IN ENGLAND AND WALES. By J. C. Dawes. International

Union of Local Authorities, 3 bis, Rue de la Regence, Brussels, Belgium. 89pp.

Public Works Engineers Yearbook, 1935. Proceedings of the American Society of Municipal Engineers and of the International Association of Public Works Officials. Joint Secretariat, ASME and IAPWO, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 336pp. $3.

Refuse Collection and Disposal. By Hazen Pratt. Rochester Bureau of Municipal Research, 45 Exchange Street, Rochester, New York. 83pp. 50 cents.

Regulations for Lighting Bridges. By United States Lighthouse Service, Washington, D. C. 10pp. 10 cents.

Some Notes on the Scientific Aspects of Controlled Tipping. By Bertram B. Jones, Director of Public Cleansing, Manchester, England. 104pp. $1.25.

Standard Specifications of the American Society of Municipal Engineers: Appendix to (their) Proceedings, 1933. Published by the Society, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 103pp.

Street and Highway Lighting Recommendations. By New Jersey State League of Municipalities, Trenton Trust Building, Trenton, New Jersey. 15pp.

Street Lighting in the State of Washington. By R. E. Towne. Association of Washington Cities, Seattle. 5pp.

A Study of Municipal Auditoriums in Buffalo, New York. By Municipal Research Bureau, White Building, Buffalo. 20pp. 50 cents.

Transit Handbook; an Analysis of the Rapid Transit Problem in New York City. By Citizen's Budget Commission, 350 Madison Avenue, New York. 47pp.

Treatise on Engineering Business Practice Relating to the Detroit Additional Water Supply Project. By Edward W. Frey. Division of Engineering, Department of Water Supply, Detroit, Michigan. 143pp.

(See also Public Utilities)

## TRAFFIC

Accident Facts. By National Safety Council, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago. 63pp.

Automobile Facts and Figures: 1934 edition. By National Automobile Chamber of Commerce, 366 Madison Avenue, New York. 96pp.

Drunken Driving Laws and Their Operation. By American Automobile Association, Washington, D. C. 15pp.

Engineering Manual for Traffic Surveys. Revised edition. By FERA, 1734 New York Avenue NW, Washington, D. C. 15 sections, unpaged.

Examining Applicants for Drivers' Licenses. By National Safety Council, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago. 30pp.

Thou Shalt Not Kill; Aids to Automobile Accident Prevention. By Travelers' Insurance Company, Hartford, Connecticut. 55pp.

Guides to Traffic Safety. By National Conference on Street and Highway Safety, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C. 48pp.

Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways. By U. S. Bureau of Public Roads, Washington, D. C.

Model Traffic Ordinances. By National Conference on Street and Highway Safety, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C. 31pp.

National Safety Council Transactions, 1934. Street and Highway Traffic Section. By National Safety Council, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago. 1935.

Report and Maps Showing Traffic Conditions Throughout Los Angeles County, Including Incorporated Cities. By Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission, Los Angeles. 1935. 32pp., 10 maps.

Short Count Traffic Surveys and Their Application to Highway Design. By Miller McClintock. Portland Cement Association, 33 West Grand Avenue, Chicago. 41pp.

Summary of Proceedings Fourth National Conference on Street and Highway Safety. Published by the Conference, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C. 51pp.

Survey of Motor Vehicle Traffic in Connecticut in 1934. By Department of Motor Vehicles, Hartford, Connecticut. 46pp.

Too Long at the Wheel. By National Safety Council, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago. 1935. 48pp. 25 cents.

Uniform Vehicle Code. Revised and approved by the Fourth National Conference on Street and Highway Safety, 1934. By the U. S. Bureau of Public Roads, Washington, D. C.

## PUBLIC UTILITIES

Domestic Electric Rates in Cities of Over 100,000. By Edgar Dow Gilman. Department of Public Utilities, Cincinnati. 46pp. Free.

Electric Rate Survey; Preliminary Report, Domestic and Residential Rates in Effect January 1, 1935, Cities of 50,000 Population and Over.. By Federal Power Commission, Washington. 1935. 73pp. Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C.

Gas Rates in Texas Cities. .By League of Texas Municipalities, Austin. 23pp.

Government-Operated Enterprises in the Panama Canal Zone. By Marshall E. Dimock.

The University of Chicago Press, Chicago. 248pp. $2.50.

Government Ownership of Public Utilities. By James G. Hodgson. H. W. Wilson Company, 958 University Avenue, New York. 194pp. 90 cents.

Municipal Electric Utilities in Michigan. By Donald M. Whitesell. Michigan Municipal League, Ann Arbor, Michigan. 104pp. $2.25.

Municipal Franchises in Oregon. By Guy S. Claire. University of Oregon, Eugene. Commonwealth Service Series. 32pp.

Municipally Owned Electric Utilities in the United States. By Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works, Washington, D. C. 64pp. $1.

Proceedings of the Western Motor Vehicle Conference Held at Salt Lake City, June 25-27, 1934, by American Legislators' Association. Published by Public Administration Service, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 51 pp. $2.

The Public Utility Franchise in Missouri. By J. R. Foster, University of Missouri Studies, Columbia, Missouri. 83pp. $1.25.

Public Utility Problems. Edited by John Bauer. National Municipal League, 309 East 34 Street, New York. 50 cents.

Public Utility Valuation: Reproduction Cost as a Basis for Depreciation and Rate-Base Determination. By Willard J. Graham. University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago. 95pp. $1.

Public Utility Valuation for Purposes of Rate Control. By John Bauer and Nathaniel Gold. Macmillan Company, 60 Fifth Avenue, New York. 477pp. $3.50.

Regulations to Govern and Preservation of Records of Public Utilities.. By New Hampshire Public Service Commission, Concord. 12pp. 25 cents.

Report of Survey to Place the Bureau of Water on a Self Supporting Basis. By Bureau of Water, Niagara Falls, New York. 42pp.

Report of the Special Committee on State and Federal Functions in the Regulation of Electric Utilities. American Bar Association, 1140 North Dearborn Street, Chicago. 43pp.

Report of the Standing Committee to Survey and Report as to Developments During the Year in the Field of Public Utility Law. American Bar Association, 1140 North Dearborn Street, Chicago. 41pp.

Report on Cost of Distribution of Electricity. By Power Authority of the State of New York, Albany. 36pp.

Residential Rates for Light and Power. By Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C. 35pp.

Results of Municipal Lighting Plants—the Answer to the City's Financial Problems. By C. F. Lambert. 3rd edition. Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Carmen's Building, Kansas City, Missouri. 139pp. $1.

Statistics of Waterways. Statistical Summary Number 17 of Bureau of Railway Economics, Washington, D. C. 24 sheets.

Water Supply and Treatment. By Charles P. Hoover. National Lime Association, 927, 15 Street, Washington, D. C. 143pp.

Water Supply Organization in the Chicago Region. By Max R. White. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. 170pp. $2.

## EDUCATION

The Adjustment Service; A Report of an Experiment in Adult Guidance. By Jerome H. Bentley. American Association for Adult Education, 60 East 42 Street, New York. 1935. 64pp.

The American Way; Democracy at Work in the Des Moines Forums. By J. W. Studebaker. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 330 West 42 Street, New York. 1935. 206pp. $2.

Centralizing Tendencies in the Administration of Public Education: A Study of Legislation for Schools in North Carolina, Maryland, and New York since 1900. By G. D. Strayer. Teachers College, Columbia University, New York. 123pp. $1.50.

A Conference Report on Financing of Public Education in New Mexico. Edited by J. E. Seyfried. New Mexico University, Albuquerque. 122pp. 25 cents.

The Co-operative School Area in Kansas. By W. E. Sheffer. State Department of Education, Topeka. 121pp.

Critical Problems in School Administration. 12th Yearbook, 1934. By Department of Superintendence, NEA, 1201, 16 Street NW, Washington, D. C. 383pp. $2.

Economies Through the Elimination of Very Small Schools. By W. H. Gaumnitz. U. S. Office of Education. (Government Printing Office, Washington. 10 cents.) 54pp.

Educational Administration as Social Policy. By J. H. Newlon. Charles Scribner's Sons, 597 Fifth Avenue, New York. 301pp. $2.

Essentials of Taxation. By Harley L. Lutz and William G. Carr. National Education Association, 1201, 16 Street, NW, Washington, D. C. 16pp.

Evaluating the Public Schools. By National Education Association and Department of Superintendence, 1201, 16 Street, NW, Washington, D. C. 48pp.

The Financing of the Public Schools of Maine; Report of a Survey of State and Local Support of Public Schools. By Maine School Finance Commission, Augusta. 271pp.

Good References on Consolidation of Schools and School Districts. By Timon Covert. United States Office of Education, Washington. 10pp. Free.

Handbook of Adult Education in the United States. By American Association for Adult Education, 60 East 42 Street, New York. 384pp.

Major Trends in Public Education. By National Education Association and Department of Superintendence, 1201, 16 Street, NW, Washington, D. C. 12pp.

Motion Picture Censors' and Reviewers' Manual. By Frederick Rex. Home Study Circle, P. O. Box 4, Hubbard Woods, Illinois. 34pp. $1.25.

Motion Pictures in Education in the United States. By Cline M. Koon. University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago. 106pp. $1.

The Nation's School Building Needs. By National Education Association, 1201, 16 Street, NW, Washington, D. C. 1935. 25 cents.

The Planning and Construction of School Buildings. By National Society for the Study of Education. Public School Publishing Company, Bloomington, Illinois.

Potential Economies in the Reorganization of Local School Attendance Units. By H. A. Little. Teachers College, Columbia University, New York. 78pp. $1.50.

Practical School Economies. By Henry H. Linn. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York. 461pp.

Principles and Practices of Financial Accounting for Schools.. By John Guy Fowlkes. E. M. Hale and Company, 3102 Cherry Street West, Milwaukee. 238pp.

Regional Surveys of Adult Education. By Jacques Ozanne. American Association for Adult Education, 60 East 42 Street, New York. 48pp.

Report by Governor's School Survey Commission (New Jersey). Solomon C. Strong, Secretary, West Orange, New Jersey. 2v. 224pp.

School Finances in Virginia: Report on the Finances of Public Free Schools. By W. H. Stauffer. Division of Purchase and Printing, Richmond. 82pp.

Some Code Controls of School Building Construction in American Cities. By John W. Sahlstrom. Columbia University, New York. 153pp. $1.50.

## LIBRARIES

Countrywide Library Service. By Ethel M. Fair. American Library Association, 520 N. Michigan Avenue, Chicago. 208pp. $2.50.

Library Projects Under FERA. By American Library Association, 520 N. Michigan Avenue, Chicago. 13pp.

Public Administration Libraries. By Committee of Civic-Social Group, Special Libraries Association. Public Administration Service, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 67pp. $1.

Public Documents; Their Selection, Distribution, Cataloging, Reproduction and Preservation. American Library Association, 520 N. Michigan Avenue, Chicago. 252pp. $2.25.

The Public Library As a Government Service. By Gertrude M. Henderson. The National League of Women Voters, Washington, D. C. 8pp. 10 cents.

A Readers' Advisory Service. By J. M. Flexner and S. A. Edge. American Association for Adult Education, 60 East 42 Street, New York. 59pp. 50 cents.

## ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

The Bar and Public Relations. By John S. Bradway. Bobbs-Merrill Company, Indianapolis, Indiana. 362pp. $5.

Cost of the Administration of the Courts in the City of New York. By Citizens Budget Commission, 350 Madison Avenue, New York. 143pp.

Crime and Criminal Statistics in Boston. By S. B. Warner. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts. 150pp. $3.

Criminal Law in Action. By John B. Waite. Sears Publishing Company, 114 Eas† 32 Street, New York. 321pp. $3.

The Defendant and Criminal Justice. By Roscoe C. Martin. University of Texas, Austin. 264pp.

First Report of the Judicial Council of the State of New York. Legislative Document 1935. 49pp.

Good Morning, Judge. A Brief Presentation of a Socialized Court with Suggestions and Discussions Applicable to the New Trial Justice Courts in Virginia. By State Department of Public Welfare, Richmond, Virginia. 52pp.

Removal of Courts from Politics. By Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, 65 Liberty Street, New York. 14pp.

Report of the Commission on the Administration of Justice in New York State. Published by the Commission, Albany. 1016pp. (Includes 21 supporting studies, several of which deal with municipal courts.)

A Standard Juvenile Court Law. By National Probation Association, 50 West 50 Street, New York. Revised edition. 33pp. 25 cents.

A Survey and Report on the Office of the Clerk of Courts of Hamilton County, Ohio. By Bureau of Governmental Research, Gwynne Building, Cincinnati. 77pp.

(See also Police; Public Welfare)

## LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURE

The Book of the States, Including Manual of Legislative Reference Services. Vol. 1, 2nd edition. By Council of State Governments and the American Legislators' Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 1935. 292pp. $2.

Expediting Legislative Procedure. By F. H. Guild. Kansas Legislative Council, Topeka, Kansas. 1935. 45pp.

Law and Practice Relating to Meetings of Local Authorities. By Albert Crew. Gee & Company, Ltd., 6 Kirby Street, E.C.1, London. 307pp.

Law Making in the United States. By Harvey Walker. Ronald Press Company, 15 East 26 Street, New York. 495pp. $4.

The Legislative Council Idea. By Dean E. McHenry. Bureau of Public Administration, University of California, Berkeley. 8pp.

Principles of Legislative Organization and Administration. By W. F. Willoughby. Brookings Institution, 722 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C. 653pp. $5.

Report and Recommendations of the Kansas Legislative Council Submitted to the Legislature. Published by the Council, Topeka. 127pp.

Uniform State Action. (A Possible Substitute for Centralization.) By W. Brooke Graves. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill. 368pp. $3.50.

## LIQUOR CONTROL

Digest of Distribution of State and Local Liquor Revenues as of May 1, 1934. By Division of Research and Statistics, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Washington, D. C. 10pp.

License Taxes Imposed Under the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act by Virginia Towns. By League of Virginia Municipalities, Richmond. 5pp. 10 cents.

Liquor Control and Liquor Taxation. By Dean E. McHenry. Bureau of Public Administration, University of California, Berkeley. (Legislative problems No. 2.) 6pp.

Liquor Laws. By E. A. Lewis. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 138pp. 15 cents.

Liquor Taxes and the Bootlegger. By Paul Studenski. National Municipal League, 309 East 34 Street, New York. 1935. 16pp. 25 cents.

Proceedings, National Liquor Conference, Chicago, June 18-19, 1934. National Conference of State Liquor Administrators (Robert K. Henry, Secretary-Treasurer), State of Wisconsin, Madison. 129pp.

Summary of Liquor License Rules and Fees in 24 Wet States. By American Municipal Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 7pp. 50 cents.

Summary of State Liquor Laws. By Dayton E. Heckman. Interstate Reference Bureau, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. 8pp. 25 cents.

Taxation of Liquor: A Study of Liquor Taxes and License Fees on Liquor Prices and Illicit Trade. By Paul Studenski. Citizen's Committee for Sane Liquor Laws, 485 Madison Avenue, New York. 44pp.

# Selected Periodicals for Municipal Officials

A list of the more important current periodicals of value to American municipal officials, arranged according to subject. All periodicals are monthly unless otherwise indicated.

## GENERAL

AMERICAN CITY. American City Magazine Corporation, 470 Fourth Avenue, New York City. $2.

AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW. (Bimonthly.) American Political Science Association, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin. $5. (Especially local government notes section.)

ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE. (Bi-monthly.) 3457 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. $5.

BULLETIN OF THE TAYLOR SOCIETY AND OF SOCIETY OF INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERS. (Bimonthly.) Federated Management Societies, 29 West 39 Street, New York. $3.

GOVERNMENTAL RESEARCH BULLETIN. Governmental Research Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. $5.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICE. (England.) National Association of Local Government Officers, 3 & 4 Clements Inn, Strand, London, W. C. 2.

MANAGEMENT REVIEW. American Management Association, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. $5.

MUNICIPAL JOURNAL. (England.) (Weekly.) Municipal Journal & Public Works Engineer, 3 & 4 Clements Inn, Strand, London, W. C. 2. 17/.

MUNICIPAL REVIEW. (England.) Association of Municipal Corporations, Palace Chambers, Bridge Street, Westminster, London, S. W. 1. 7¾/6.

MUNICIPAL REVIEW OF CANADA. Municipal Publishing Company, Ltd., 610 Lagauchetiere Street West, Montreal, Quebec. $2.50.

NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW. National Municipal League, 309 East 34 Street, New York City. $5.

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION. (Quarterly.) Institute of Public Administration, Palace Chambers, Bridge Street, Westminster, S. W. 1, London. 12/6.

PUBLIC MANAGEMENT. International City Managers' Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago, Illinois. $4.

STATE GOVERNMENT. American Legislators' Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. $2.50.

UNITED STATES MUNICIPAL NEWS. (Bi-Monthly.) American Municipal Association and United States Conference of Mayors, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. $6.

UNITED STATES NEWS. (Weekly.) 22nd and M. Streets, N. W., Washington, D. C. $5.

## PERSONNEL

CIVIL SERVICE OBSERVER. Western Regional Conference, Civil Service Assembly, 442 Capitol Building, Sacramento, California. $1.

PERSONNEL. (Quarterly.) American Management Association, 20 Vesey St., New York. (Free to members.)

PERSONNEL JOURNAL. (Bi-monthly.) The Personnel Research Federation, 29 West 39 Street, New York. $5.

## MUNICIPAL FINANCE

BOND BUYER. (Weekly, $25; Daily, $15 per month.) Bond Buyer, 67 Pearl Street, New York City.

BULLETIN OF THE NATIONAL TAX ASSOCIATION. National Tax Association, 195 Broadway, New York City. $2.

COMMERCIAL AND FINANCIAL CHRONICLE. (Weekly.) William B. Dana Company, Spruce Street, Corner William, New York. $10.

MUNICIPAL FINANCE. (Quarterly.) Municipal Finance Officers' Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. $1.50.

MUNICIPAL FINANCE NEWS LETTER. (Bi-weekly.) Municipal Finance Officers' Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. $2.50.

PURCHASING AGENT. National Association of Purchasing Agents, 53 Park Place, New York City. $2.

TAXBITS. Tax Policy League, 309 East 34 Street, New York. $3.

TAX DIGEST. California Taxpayers' Association, 775 Subway Terminal Building, Los Angeles, California. $2.

TAX MAGAZINE. Commerce Clearing House, Inc., 205 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Illinois. $4.

## POLICE

JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW AND CRIMINOLOGY. (Bi-monthly.) Northwestern University

School of Law, 357 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. $3.50.

National Police Officer. National Police Publishing Company, 14 North Central Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri. $2.

Police Chiefs' News Letter. International Association of Chiefs of Police, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago.

Police Journal. (England.) (Quarterly.) Philip Allan & Company, Ltd., 69 Great Russell Street, London, W. C. 1. 5/.

Police Journal. 1123 Broadway, New York. $2.

Uniform Crime Reports. (Quarterly.) Division of Investigation, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C. Free to public officials.

## FIRE

Fire Engineering. Case-Shepperd-Mann Publishing Corporation, 24 West 40 Street, New York City. $2.

Fire Protection. National Underwriter Company, 420 East Fourth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. $1.50.

International Fire Fighter. International Association of Fire Fighters, A. F. of L. Building, Washington, D. C.

National Fire Protection Association Quarterly. (Quarterly.) National Fire Protection Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston. $3.

Volunteer Firemen. National Fire Protection Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston.

## PUBLIC WORKS

Airports. Bank of Manhattan Company Building, Flushing, New York. $1.

Civil Engineering. American Society of Civil Engineers, 33 West 39 Street, New York City. $4.

Contractors and Engineers Monthly. Buttenheim-Dix Publishing Corporation, 470 Fourth Avenue, New York. $1.

Engineering News-Record. (Weekly.) McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, 330 West 42 Street, New York City. $5.

Municipal Sanitation. Case-Shepperd-Mann Publishing Company, 24 West 40 Street, New York City. $2.

Public Cleansing. (Quarterly.) Public Cleansing, Oakfield, North Queensferry, Fife, Scotland. 10/6.

Public Roads. Bureau of Public Roads, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Willard Building, Washington, D. C. $1.

Public Works. A. Prescott Folwell, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. $4.

Public Works Engineers' News Letter. American Society of Municipal Engineers and International Association of Public Works Officials, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. $1.

Roads and Streets. Gillette Publishing Company, 400 West Madison Street, Chicago. $2.

Sewage Works Journal. (Bi-monthly.) Federation of Sewage Works Association, 848 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago. $2.

## CITY PLANNING

International Housing and Town Planning Bulletin. International Federation for Housing and Town Planning, 25 Bedford Row, London, W. C. 1.

Land Policy Review. Agricultural Adjustment Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

News Letter of American Society of Planning Officials. 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. $2.

Planning and Civic Comment. (Quarterly.) American Civic Association and National Conference on City Planning, 901 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. $5.

The Land Today and Tomorrow. U. S. Soil Erosion Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

Town and Country Planning. (Quarterly.) Garden Cities and Town Planning Association, 3 Gray's Inn Pl., Gray's Inn, London, W. C. 1. 5/.

Town Planning Review. (Quarterly.) Town Planning Review, University Press of Liverpool, Liverpool, England. 15/.

## HOUSING

Housing. (Quarterly.) National Housing Association, 105 East 22 Street, New York City. $4.

Housing Information Bureau Monthly News Letter. Housing Section, Welfare Council, 122 East 22 Street, New York. $1.

Housing Study Bulletin. Housing Study Guild, 101 Park Avenue, New York. $2.

Public Housing Progress. National Public Housing Conference, 112 East 19 Street, New York. $2.

## PUBLIC WELFARE

American Labor Legislation Review. (Quarterly.) 131 East 23 Street, New York City. $3.

Better Times. (Quarterly, also News Bulletin Weekly, October to June.) Welfare Council of New York City, 122 East 22 Street, New York City. $3.

Compass. By American Association of Social Workers, 130 East 22 Street, New York City. $1.

Monthly Labor Review. U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. $1.50.

Public Welfare News. American Public Welfare Association, 850 East 58 Street, Chicago. $1.

Rural Rehabilitation. Federal Emergency Relief Administration, 1734 New York Avenue, Washington, D. C. Free.

Social Forces. (Quarterly.) Social Forces, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. $4.

Social Security. American Association for Social Security, 22 East 17 Street, New York City. $2.

Social Service Review. (Quarterly.) University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago. $4.

Social Statistics Bulletin. (Quarterly.) Children's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

Survey and Survey Graphic. (Bi-weekly.) Survey Associates, Inc., 112 East 19 Street, New York City. $5.

The Project. Educational Division of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Washington, D. C. Free.

## PARKS AND RECREATION

Parks and Recreation. American Institute of Park Executives, 327 West Jefferson Street, Rockford, Illinois. $3.

Recreation. National Recreation Association, 315 Fourth Avenue, New York City. $2.

## PUBLIC HEALTH

American Journal of Public Health. American Public Health Association, 450 Seventh Avenue, New York City. $5.

Mental Hygiene. National Committee for Mental Hygiene, 450 Seventh Avenue, New York City. $3.

Milk Dealer. Olsen Publishing Company, Milwaukee. $2.

Public Health Nursing. National Organization for Public Health Nursing, 50 West 50 Street, New York. $3.

Public Health Reports. (Weekly.) U. S. Public Health Service, Treasury Department. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. $1.50.

## PUBLIC UTILITIES

Journal of Land and Public Utility Economics. (Quarterly.) Institute for Economic Research, 357 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. $5.

Journal of the American Water Works Association. 2411 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Maryland. $7.

Public Ownership. Public Ownership League of America, 127 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois. $3.

Public Utilities Fortnightly. (Semi-monthly.) Public Utilities Reports, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. $15.

Shipping Register and World Ports. (Weekly.) 922 Victoria Square, Montreal, Quebec. $5.

Water Works and Sewerage. Gillette Publishing Company, Daily News Building, Chicago, Illinois. $1.

Water Works Engineering. (Bi-weekly.) Case-Shepperd-Mann Publishing Corporation, 24 West 40 Street, New York. $2.

## PUBLIC SAFETY

Public Safety. National Safety Council, Inc., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois. $1.

## EDUCATION

American School Board Journal. The Bruce Publishing Company, 524-44 North Milwaukee Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. $3.

Educational Record. (Quarterly.) American Council on Education, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C. $2.

Journal of Adult Education. (Quarterly.) American Association for Adult Education, 60 East 42 Street, New York. $2.

Journal of the National Education Association. (Monthly except July, August, and September.) National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. $2.

Nation's Schools. 919 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago. $2.

Research Bulletin of the National Education Association. (Five times a year.) 1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. $1.

School Executives' Magazine. 1126 Q Street, Lincoln, Nebraska. $2.

School Life. (Monthly, September-June.) U. S. Department of Interior, Office of Education, Washington, D. C. (Order from Superintendent of Documents.) $1.

## LIBRARIES

Bulletin of the American Library Association. American Library Association, 520 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago. $3.

Library Journal. (Bi-monthly.) 62 West 45 Street, New York City. $5.

Library Quarterly. (Quarterly.) The University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago. $5.

Special Libraries. Special Libraries Association, 345 Hudson Street, New York. $5.

## COURTS

Journal of the American Judicature Society. (Bi-monthly.) American Judicature Society, Law School Building, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Free.

Legal Aid Review. (Quarterly.) Legal Aid Society, 11 Park Place, New York City.

Panel. Association of Grand Jurors of New

York County, 105 West 40 Street, New York City.

## STATE LEAGUE JOURNALS

AMERICAN MUNICIPALITIES. League of Iowa Municipalities, 21 West Main Street, Marshalltown, Iowa. $1.

ARKANSAS MUNICIPALITIES. Arkansas Municipal League, Fayetteville, Arkansas. $1.25.

BOROUGH BULLETIN. Pennsylvania State Association of Boroughs, Hanover, Pennsylvania. $2.50.

COLORADO MUNICIPALITIES. Bureau of Business and Government Research, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado. $1.50.

FLORIDA MUNICIPAL RECORD. Florida League of Municipalities, 1707 Barnett National Bank Building, Jacksonville, Florida. $2.

ILLINOIS MUNICIPAL REVIEW. Illinois Municipal League, 500 Capitol Avenue, Springfield, Illinois. $2.

KANSAS MUNICIPALITIES. League of Kansas Municipalities, Lawrence, Kansas. $2.

KENTUCKY CITY. Kentucky Municipal League, Lexington, Kentucky. $2.

MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL REVIEW. Michigan Municipal League, Ann Arbor, Michigan. $2.

MINNESOTA MUNICIPALITIES. League of Minnesota Municipalities, 16 University Library, Minneapolis, Minnesota. $2.50.

MUNICIPALITY. League of Wisconsin Municipalities, 114 North Carroll Street, Madison, Wisconsin. $2.50.

MUNICIPAL LEAGUE REVIEW. Municipal League of Indiana, Kokomo, Indiana. $1.50.

NEBRASKA MUNICIPAL REVIEW. League of Nebraska Municipalities, Crete, Nebraska. $1.

NEW JERSEY MUNICIPALITIES. New Jersey State League of Municipalities, 802 Trenton Trust Building, Trenton, New Jersey. $2.

OKLAHOMA MUNICIPAL REVIEW. Oklahoma Municipal League, Monnett Hall, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma. $2.

TEXAS MUNICIPALITIES. League of Texas Municipalities, 2200 Guadalupe Street, Austin, Texas. $2.

VIRGINIA MUNICIPAL REVIEW. League of Virginia Municipalities, Travelers Building, Richmond, Virginia. $2.

WESTERN CITY. League of California Municipalities, 333 Roosevelt Building, Los Angeles, California. (Also official journal for Oregon and Washington leagues.) $2.

# Index

Accounting, 34-36
Administrative law, 45-51
Administrative organization, 7-11, 45-46
Aldermen, *See* Councilmen
Area, *See* Land area
Assessed valuation, 321, 323-328
Assessments, 24-30, 323-328
Assessors: analysis of position, 244; directory, 270-291; professional organization, 228; tenure, 242; turnover, 243

Bibliography, 371-390
Boards and commissions, 7-10
Bond sales: expenditures, 329-334; receipts, 323-328
Bonded debt, *See* Indebtedness
Bonds issued and redeemed, 335-342
Books and pamphlets, Recent, 371-386
Borrowing against current income, 323-328; repayment, 329-334
Budget, 22-24

Capital outlays, 329-334
Cities: Classification, 136-163
City attorneys: analysis of position, 244; directory, 247-269; professional organization, 228; tenure, 242; turnover, 243
City clerks: analysis of position, 244; directory, 247-269; tenure, 242; turnover, 243
City managers, 229-240; analysis of position, 244; appointments, 229-230; cases, 46-47; directory, 232-240; length of service, 230-231; number of cities served by, 230; professional organization, 226-227; *See also* Council-manager plan
City officials: directory, 241-315
City planning, 51-54; national organizations and federal agencies, 350-351
City planning officials: professional organization, 228
Civic awards, 242-243
Civil service commissions: cases, 50-51; *See also* Personnel
Commission plan: legal provisions, 140-141
Consolidation, 11, 45-46
Constitutional provisions, 136-163
Cost of government, *See* Finance
Council-manager plan, 141-142; directory, 232-240
Councilmen: election, 170-187; number, 166-167, 170-187; terms, 167, 170-187
County government, 110-113
County manager, 45
Crime classification, 77; *See also* Police

Debts, 321; expenditures for debt service, 329-334
Delinquent taxes, *See* Tax delinquency
Directories, 170-187; city managers, 232-240; city officials, 241-315

Education, 100-104; national organizations and federal agencies, 368-369; *See also* Schools
Elections, 167-168, 170-187; number of voters, 168
Engineers, City: analysis of position, 245; directory, 247-269; professional organization, 225; tenure, 242; turnover, 243
Expenditures, 320-321, 329-334

Federal agencies: services, 346-370
Finance, 15-21, 319-342; national organizations and federal agencies, 348-350; *See also* Accounting; Assessments; Budget; Debts; Indebtedness; Purchasing; Taxation
Finance officers: analysis of position, 244; directory, 270-291; professional organization, 226; tenure, 242; turnover, 243
Financial statistics of cities, 319-342
Fire administration, 80-85; national organizations and federal agencies, 360-361
Fire chiefs: analysis of position, 246; directory, 293-315; professional organization, 224; tenure, 242; turnover, 243
Fire insurance, *See* Insurance, Fire
Form of government, 164-167, 170-187; legal provisions, 136-163

Grants and shares: receipts, 323-328

Health, 72-74; national organizations and federal agencies, 357-359
Health insurance, *See* Insurance, Social
Health officers: analysis of position, 245; directory, 270-291; professional organization, 224; tenure, 242; turnover, 243
Home rule, *See* Constitutional provisions
Housing, 67-72; national organizations and federal agencies, 359-360
Housing officials: professional organization, 227-228

Indebtedness, 335-342
Inspection: national organizations and federal agencies, 365-366
Insurance, Fire, 82-83
Insurance, Social, 64-65

Judicial administration, 107-109

Land area, 170-187
Law, 45-51
Leagues of municipalities, 188-198; journals, 390
Librarians: analysis of position, 246; directory, 247-269; professional organization, 224; tenure, 242; turnover, 243

Libraries, 104-106; national organizations and federal agencies, 370

Mayor-council plan: legal provisions, 137-140
Mayors: analysis of position, 243-244; directory, 247-269; tenure, 242; turnover, 243
Metropolitan areas, 11
Municipal administration, 3-7; national organizations and federal agencies, 346-347
Municipal corporations, 39-44; law, 136-163
Municipal leagues, *See* Leagues of municipalities
Municipal officials: organizations, 222-228
Municipal powers, 39-44
Municipal utilities, 91-100, 168-169, 170-187; bonded debt, 335-342; expenditures, 329-334; national organizations and federal agencies, 366-368; receipts, 323-328

National organizations: services, 346-370; *See also* Professional Organizations
Nepotism, 49-50

Old age pensions, *See* Pensions, Old age

Parks and recreation, 55-58; national organizations and federal agencies, 355-356
Parks and recreation, Directors of: analysis of position, 245; directory, 293-315; professional organizations, 225, 226; tenure, 242; turnover, 243
Pensions, *See* Retirement systems
Pensions, Old age, 64-65
Periodicals, 387-390
Personnel, 12-15, 201-221; cases, 48-51; national organizations and federal agencies, 347-348; number of employees, 201-202, 204-209; professional organization, 226; salaries, 202-209; *See also* Training; *also* names of officials
Playgrounds, 55-58
Police, 75-80; national organizations and federal agencies, 351-353; training, 77
Police chiefs: analysis of position, 246; directory, 293-315; professional organization, 225; tenure, 242; turnover, 243
Population: over 21, 170-187; total, 170-187
Professional organizations, 222-228; *See also* National organizations: Services
Public administration, 3-7, 7-11; *See also* Municipal Administration
Public health, *See* Health
Public welfare and relief, 58-67; expenditures, 329-334; national organizations and federal agencies, 353-355
Public welfare directors: analysis of position, 245; directory, 270-291; professional organization, 227; tenure, 242; turnover, 243
Public works, 86-91; national organizations and federal agencies, 361-365; *See also* Municipal utilities
Public works directors: analysis of position, 245; directory, 293-315; professional organization, 227; tenure, 242; turnover, 243
Purchasing, 37-39
Purchasing agents: analysis of position, 245; directory, 270-291; professional organization, 227; tenure, 242; turnover, 243

Receipts, 319-320, 323-328
Recreation, 55-58; *See also* Parks and recreation
Retirement systems, 210-221; actuarial status, 211-212; nature of contributions, 211-212
Revenue, 31-34, 323-328

Salaries, 202-209; cuts, 203-209; restorations, 204-209
School superintendents: analysis of position, 246; directory, 247-269; professional organization, 223-224; tenure, 242; turnover, 243
Schools: bonded debt, 335-342; expenditures, 329-334; receipts, 323-328
Service charge financing, 88-89
Sewage disposal, 88-90
Social insurance, *See* Insurance, Social
Sources of information, 345-370
Special assessments, 30; bonds, 335-342
State codes, 136-137
State correspondents, 2

Tax collection, 25, 27-29
Tax delinquency, 27-28, 321, 323-328
Tax limits, 26-27
Tax receivership, 28
Taxation, 24-30, 323-328; *See also* Assessed valuation; Assessments
Tennessee Valley Authority, 97
Traffic control, 78-80
Training: Firemen, 83; general, 14; police, 77
Treasurers, City: analysis of position, 244; directory, 270-291; professional organization, 226; tenure, 242; turnover, 243

Unemployment insurance, *See* Insurance, Social
Unemployment relief, 58-67
Utilities, *See* Municipal Utilities

Voters: number in last council election, 170-187

Waterworks superintendents: analysis of position, 245-246; directory, 293-315; professional organization, 224-225; tenure, 242; turnover, 243

Zoning, 51-54; national organizations and federal agencies, 350-351